

THE DUBLIN REVIEW.

JULY, 1879.

3rd 5 Vol 2

ART. I.—THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC; SHOULD IT BE PROHIBITED?

*Report of the Select Committee of the House of Lords on
Intemperance. London, 1879.*

(The question of the liquor traffic is one of such extreme importance at this moment that we are glad to insert an Article in which the facts of the subject are ably dealt with.)

AS the publication of the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Intemperance is once more attracting considerable attention to the question of "How to deal with the liquor traffic," it may not be out of place to give a brief statement of the argument in favour of one proposed solution which has the recommendation of being the only one which has hitherto proved practically successful to any appreciable extent. Such a statement seems the more desirable—1st, Because the Lords' Committee, while they devote a considerable space in their Report to a discussion of permissive local prohibition, refer only incidentally to total imperial prohibition; and 2d, Because, although in dealing with the question of drunkenness and its attendant evils, all recent writers and speakers of note (Lord Aberdare, Mr. Lowe, M.P., Mr. W. E. Forster, M.P., Mr. J. Chamberlain, M.P., and Mr. Peek in particular,) have been agreed in deeming it necessary that some reference should be made to total prohibition, unfortunately each has thought it sufficient to do little more than express his opinion that such a thing would be impracticable—i.e., could not be enforced if adopted—without favouring us with the reasons

that have induced him to form that opinion. Mr. Peek does indeed urge that

Any legislation in the shape of entire prohibition, except under most exceptional and rare circumstances, has one fatal fault—namely, that it goes far beyond the general feeling of the country, while in every self-governed state the first essential to all successful reforms is that they shall have the support of public opinion. Any legislation or any attempt at legislation without such support must fail, and such will often produce a reaction of feeling which hinders not only legislative progress, but also the very formation of that opinion which is so desirable.*

No one, however, imagines that there will be any legislative prohibition of the liquor traffic—engrafted as it is by custom and prejudice into the very constitution of the nation—until it has “the support of public opinion,” and is the expression of “the general feeling of the country.” There will ever be such a desire to postpone as long as may be the adoption of so stringent a remedy, that Parliament will never pass it until a large majority of the people declare themselves in its favour and demand its enactment.† The objection is groundless against everything but immediate prohibition, unless it can be proved that public opinion never will be in its favour, and this cannot be done without first showing that prohibition is unnecessary—that is, that our national intemperance can be cured by some other means, or that the evil is not so great as to justify such a radical measure. For, as has been fairly urged,‡ if prohibition is necessary, all objections against it on the ground of impracticability are a reflection on our intelligence and patriotism : for they assume that the people are either too stupid to be convinced, or that, if convinced, they have neither sense nor spirit enough to act upon their convictions. No change of law is impracticable which depends on the voice of the people, guided by the information they possess. It may, for lack of acquaintance with the facts, be impracticable at one time ; but that is only the greater reason why agitation should be continued, and everything done that may impart light, so that the necessary legislation may be rendered practicable and certain.

The best reply to the objection that prohibition is impracticable, however, is that in the United States of America it has been adopted, and is remarkably successful, and there is not

* Article in the *Contemporary Review*, December, 1876.

† The Parliamentary History of the Irish Sunday Closing Bill is an illustration of this.

‡ “Christendom and the Drink Curse,” by the Rev. D. Burns, M.A., F.S.S.

sufficient difference in the constitution, circumstances, and habits of the two peoples to justify the opinion that what has been done there cannot be done here.

The opinion, (held also by Mr. Chamberlain and apparently by Mr. John Bright), that the advocacy of an extreme measure hinders the adoption of a moderate one, is based on the assumption that the prospect of the extreme measure being accepted is utterly utopian and hopeless: failing that, it is not consistent with general experience. The fact is, it is the advocacy of so-called extreme measures that make moderate measures possible. We are so much a people of compromise, and in legislation we so seldom, if ever, carry a principle to its logical conclusion, that it has become almost a maxim that more should be asked for than is expected, knowing that what is granted is usually short of, but in proportion to, what is demanded. The prominent position of the temperance question to-day and recent legislation in reference to licensing are both chiefly owing to the persistent agitation of teetotalers and prohibitionists. Agitation for measures of reform is the only means by which public opinion can be educated up to the required standard; and action in such matters must be taken by the few. "The history of minorities," it has been well said, "is the history of success." Those who hold that the prohibition of the liquor traffic is the only remedy for intemperance are in duty bound to publish that conviction, but not necessarily to demand that it be immediately acted upon. No wise reformer would, if he had the power, place on the Statute Book any law in *opposition* to public opinion. He will prefer getting the improvement by instalments (as large and as frequent as practicable); never omitting to let it be distinctly understood that they are only instalments and not settlements—instalments that are only satisfactory in proportion as they approach his ultimate ideal. There is a wide distinction between a law in *opposition* to public opinion and one merely in *advance* of such opinion. In the one case dislike and evasion will almost certainly result, while in the other, if the law be just and based on sound principles, its effect may be instructive and elevating.

Coming to the question of the right of the people to totally prohibit the sale of drink, we find that while the Lords' Committee admit that

If the common sale of alcoholic liquors be a thing so universally pernicious, and so incapable of regulation as the advocates of the Permissive Bill maintain that it is, then it should be universally prohibited by a general Act of the Legislature (p. xxi.).

they deny that it is accompanied by such evils as to justify its prohibition, and they declare that

It does not seem, therefore, either just or expedient that the purchase and moderate use of liquor by the majority of persons should be prevented because there are some who abuse it to their own hurt or that of others.

Unquestionably there is a certain undefined and not very logical opinion generally held that the legislature has no right to prevent people getting what they like to drink. Mr. Lowe, advocating free-trade in drink, states that

In intemperance we have to deal not with a wrong that we can redress, nor with a crime which we can punish, but a vice, an evil habit, which is not within the reach of the law without an intolerable inroad on personal liberty.*

Lord Aberdare put the issue thus to one of the witnesses before the Committee :

The question is whether it is right to impose upon a vast number of people who find innocent enjoyment in drink an amount of self-denial which they do not seek themselves, and which they would consider a hardship.

And Mr. W. E. Forster, speaking at Bradford on Prohibition, said :

He would not at that time and place say how far it was or was not the province of the law to interfere between men and the getting of drink if they wished to take it, but in vindication of himself he would state that he still attached meaning to the old phrase, "Liberty of the subject," and that he still thought there ought to be very strong grounds indeed to justify the law coming to any man and saying, "We will choose what you eat and drink and wear." He had, therefore, very great doubts whether the law could step in to prevent liquor being sold, and consequently to prevent its being bought.†

This question of "the liberty of the subject" touches the fundamental principle upon which civilised society is based, and as it is made the groundwork of many objections to prohibition, it will be well, before going further, to briefly consider the bases of government and legislation, and their bearing on the suppression of evil—with special reference to the evil of intemperance.

If it be correct that the object of good government is to promote the well-being of the subject by guarding liberties, virtue, and morals, by affording protection to life and property, and by

* *Fortnightly Review*, January, 1877.

† November 14th, 1878.

encouraging the growth of that which will increase the general happiness and prosperity, it is within the province of a Government, indeed it is its duty, to sanction only such occupations as will be in conformity with the general well-being, and to prohibit those the consequences of which will be more injurious than beneficial to the people. Government implies a limitation of freedom, and individual liberty must give way to the good of the State. Legitimate civil liberty being defined as freedom to do whatsoever is wished so far and so long as its being done does not injuriously affect the well-being, or interfere with the same liberty of the rest of the community, law is essential to such liberty, and there will be no opposition between good laws and true civil liberty. All legislative coercion and interference is a restraint, but it is a restraint which is necessary for the prevention of greater evils.* Were human nature perfect there would be no necessity for restrictive legislation of any kind, because every man would be able to do as he wished, since he would wish to do only what was right and just.

No one has a right to demand that his wishes shall be gratified at the expense of the general weal. However moderately a man may indulge in the use of alcoholic liquors, and however beneficial to himself he may imagine that indulgence to be, he has no right to demand that their public sale shall be allowed, in order that he may provide himself with them, when it has been proved that society at large is injuriously affected by such sale.† If it is found that the evil occasioned by the traffic—material, physical, social, and moral—far outweighs any real or supposed benefits that are derived therefrom, and that no other remedy has proved, or is likely to prove successful, the Government will be justified in prohibiting the sale, even for moderate use, of that which in so many cases leads to mischief being done. And it will be no valid reason for any one to urge in opposition to such prohibition that *they* will not exceed proper limits. The point at issue is not, as it is often put, whether because one man likes beer and two do not, the two should prevent the one from getting his beer. It is not a question of individual likes and dislikes, but of effects on others. If the drink was merely injurious to those who took it, any one could by abstaining protect himself against it; but it is also socially injurious, and

* "All that makes existence valuable to any one, depends on the enforcement of restraints upon the actions of other people."—J. S. Mill "On Liberty," p. 3. People's edition.

† "Every public-house tends to aggravate the public rates, and to create disorder; and it also causes an additional necessity for the police."—Mr. Bruce's (now Lord Aberdare) speech in the House of Commons, April 3, 1871.

society is powerless to protect itself without the aid of law. Temperance reformers have no desire to interfere with what a man "shall eat, drink, or wear ;" but if his eating, drinking, or wearing interferes with them by injuriously affecting the community, then they are bound to step in and claim respect for their liberty, and demand that that injury shall cease, and if it cannot cease without the prohibition of the sale of a particular article of diet or clothing, such sale must be prohibited. If drink can be obtained and used in such a way that no one suffers besides the drinker, interference might be unnecessary and unjust : but, if in order to supply the wants of himself and others like him, places are opened which are a nuisance and result in evil to the community, it will be justified in suppressing them, and the reply to the objector is, " If you want these drinks you must devise some means whereby you may obtain them without subjecting others to injury or annoyance : failing that you must do without them." At the present time to sell bad meat, to expose obscene pictures, or to keep gunpowder or petroleum in large quantities, is not allowed by law. Men may use these things themselves, they may eat bad food, have obscene pictures in their house for their own gratification, and use gunpowder and petroleum, but they may not keep, expose, or sell them as they like. Why ? Because doing so would affect the moral or physical well-being of others, and the moment that is done the law steps in. We may admit, in reply to an objection frequently raised against legislation on questions of morality and conduct, that no laws can make a nation righteous ; but they can do much to facilitate its becoming and remaining so. Man is a free agent, and on questions of morality and conscience he cannot be coerced ; but he may be induced and led : he is susceptible to outward influence. Inducements may be held out to him, or obstacles placed in his way, that will lead him to adopt this course of conduct and abandon that. This indicates the legitimate sphere of government. It should respect man's freedom ; yet, as Mr. Gladstone put it, " It ought to make it easy for him to do what is right, and difficult for him to do wrong."

The argument for prohibition may now be formulated thus:—

I. The evils of the drinking system are so terrible, so widespread, and so antagonistic to the welfare of the nation that they must be remedied at almost any cost.

II. No system of regulating the Traffic, nor any efforts of social and moral reformers have counteracted, or can ever effectually counteract the evils of intemperance, so long as the sale of drink is allowed.

III. The Total Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic is essential

to success in grappling with the evils of the drinking system—it would enable the nation to abolish intemperance, and obviate the injury it does.

The first point needs little enforcement, for the effect of the liquor traffic in barricading all paths of progress, in counteracting the influence and stunting the growth of freedom, morality, and virtue, and in encouraging the development of the worst phases of man's character, is well known. To the ruin engendered by drunkenness all bear witness. To quote the eloquent words of Canon Farrar :

From the army, from the navy, from great cities, from country villages, from the police, from guardians of the poor, from manufacturers, from merchants, from all large employers of labour, from physicians, from judges, from the clergy of every denomination, and most often and most bitterly from the working men themselves, come pouring in the accumulated testimonies—emphatic, heartrending, unmistakable, reiterated—to the prevalence, to the increase, to the deadliness of this degrading sin.

Nevertheless a summary of the more striking facts is necessary for the completeness of the argument.

As a nation we spend 140,000,000*l.* a year on alcoholic liquors. The sum spent during the last four years would have purchased all the railways in the country, and the sum spent during the last six years would have paid off the National Debt. Now, if these liquors are practically useless—as many affirm they are—if they answer no good purpose, being at best only a luxury, that sum, with the exception of the portion (about 34,000,000*l.*) which yearly accrues to the revenue, represents a great waste. The medical declaration extensively signed by the leading members of the medical profession in 1846 stated that

The most perfect health is compatible with total abstinence from all such intoxicating beverages, whether in the form of ardent spirits, or as wine, beer, ale, porter, cider, &c.; that total and universal abstinence from alcoholic liquors, and intoxicating beverages of all sorts, would greatly contribute to the health, the prosperity, the morality, and the happiness of the human race.

The accuracy of these opinions has been abundantly confirmed by subsequent experience and research. Stronger evidence as to the practical uselessness of alcoholic liquors as beverages is, however, not required, than that given before the Lords' Committee by the eminent medical authorities who attended for the purpose. They united in declaring their conviction that

Alcohol does not build up any tissue in the body.* In cold weather its effect is to lower the temperature of the body and not to raise it, as is popularly believed.† It is not only useless, but positively injurious, in prolonged muscular exertion.‡

And the opinions expressed in the following opinions are singularly harmonious and emphatic:—

Dr. Brunton.—In small quantities, I believe it may be taken as a luxury without doing any harm: the quantity, however, is very small.§

Dr. Burdon-Sanderson.—My belief is that upon the whole the human race would be situated just as favourably if the use of alcohol did not exist. I think that for two reasons. In the first place, because the evils certainly preponderate over the benefits—that is certainly one reason; and the other consideration is simply that all the benefits are dispensable benefits. There is no benefit which we derive from alcohol in a state of health which we could not do without; although we could not possibly do without the use of alcohol in disease.||

Sir Wm. Gull.—I should say from my experience that it (alcohol) is the most deleterious agent that we are aware of in this country.¶

Sir Henry Thompson.—I think a man is generally better without alcoholic drinks.**

Dr. W. B. Richardson expressed his conviction that if all the alcoholic liquor in the world could be tapped off and let flow and disappear, the world would be much the better for it; we should be stronger and healthier, and life would be lengthened.††

The value of medical opinion as to the necessity or desirability of using alcoholic liquors as beverages is, after all, quite subordinate to the testimony of practical experience. The majority of medical men have paid little attention to the subject, and consequently really know little of it; but the few who have studied it declare almost unanimously in favour of the views expressed above.‡‡

* Dr. Burdon-Sanderson, Third Report, p. 163. Dr. Richardson, Fourth Report, p. 238.

† Dr. Brunton, Third Report, pp. 149, 150. Sir Wm. Gull, Third Report, p. 246. Dr. Richardson, Fourth Report, p. 237.

‡ Dr. Burdon-Sanderson, Third Report, p. 165. Dr. Richardson, Fourth Report, p. 237.

§ Third Report, p. 156.

|| Third Report, p. 166.

¶ Third Report, p. 245.

** Fourth Report, p. 70.

†† Fourth Report, pp. 242, 243.

‡‡ According to the Archbishop of York, Sir James Paget declined to give evidence before the Lords' Committee, because he had given no special attention to the question; and Sir Wm. Gull in his evidence said: "I do not know how alcohol does act upon the body altogether. I do not think it is known, but I know it is a most deleterious poison" (Third Report, p. 246).

That these drinks are not a necessity seems clear from the fact that whole nations in various parts of the world pass through life without them. Further, if they are in any degree beneficial to health, if they assist any part of our system in the discharge of its functions, if they contribute to any appreciable extent to keep our bodies or minds in proper working order, either by direct assistance or by protecting them from injury, it must follow that any one who is deprived of these liquors must be so much the worse in proportion to the benefit to be derived from them. Nothing can be a benefit of which it is no loss to be deprived. In our own country hundreds of thousands of people do not drink intoxicating liquors, nor are they provided with a substitute, yet it has never been proved that they are, in consequence of their non-use of these liquors, in any way, morally or physically, incapacitated for the discharge of all the duties of life. On the contrary, it has been conclusively proved that, compared with those who do take the drink, even in what is called a "proper way," they are the healthier, the less injurious, and the more moral citizens. They suffer less from sickness and disease, they are longer lived, and their names are far less frequently found in the list of those who are known as our pauper and criminal classes.

Commercially, the waste of 140,000,000*l.* annually is a great strain on the financial stability of the nation; and the strain is at least doubled by the indirect loss involved in that waste.

Three-fourths of our pauperism and crime and one-third of our lunacy are distinctly traceable to the drinking system.*

A moderate estimate places the number of deaths annually resulting, directly and indirectly, from the use of intoxicating drinks at 100,000.†

These are short statements of serious facts: space will not allow more. This waste, pauperism, crime, insanity, and pre-

* 1. In the Convocation of Canterbury Report on Intemperance the testimony of 119 governors of workhouses is quoted. Of these 80 state the proportion of pauperism that they consider to be the result of intemperance, not one gives it lower than one-half, and the average estimate is 73 per cent.

2. Lord Chief Justice Coleridge, at the Durham Spring Assizes, in 1877, said: "If we could make England sober we might shut up nine-tenths of our gaols." Again, at the Bristol Autumn Assizes last year he made the same statement, adding, "The large majority of criminal cases began or ended or were connected with the public-house or drunkenness."

† 1. See Paper read by Mr. Norman Kerr, M.D., at the Social Science Congress at Cheltenham, October 29th, 1878, on "The Mortality from Intemperance;" and the discussion.

2. The Official Returns of the United Kingdom Temperance and General Provident Institution (established 1840) show a mortality in the moderate

mature death are a terrible cost and burden to the nation and to each individual as part of it. They weight us seriously in the race of competition with other nations; in times of prosperity they drag us down, and in bad times they drive us still deeper into the mire. What this nation has suffered and is suffering from the waste of energy and time, from the "intellectual pauperism," and from the deterioration in manual dexterity amongst its trading and working classes in consequence of their drinking customs, can never be estimated. The lack of what might have been done and of what now ought to be done for English commerce is being severely felt in this time of depression and severe competition. In the struggle for commercial supremacy which is becoming so fierce we are by no means so far ahead of other competitors as we used to be, and the danger is that, unless we can keep both masters and workmen away from the drink—unless we can ensure that our inventors, designers and artisans shall have clear heads and steady hands—we shall, in spite of our natural advantages, have to rank second to nations with whom the worship of Bacchus has not become a mania and a crime.

Nor is this all. Since 1860 female intemperance has in-

drinking section of those insured of 17 per cent. higher than in the abstaining section.

3. About 130,000 children die in England every year before they are twelve months old. In March, 1876, the Deputy-Coroner for Middlesex stated that in that district alone 300 children were suffocated annually in bed, seven-tenths of these cases occurring on Sunday mornings, and that such cases were very often the outcome of parental intemperance.

4. "Seven-eighths of the persons run over in the streets of London are drunk when they fall under the horses' hoofs or carriage wheels."—*The Lancet*, June, 1868.

5. G. H. B. McLeod, Regius Professor of Surgery in the University of Glasgow (February, 1874), said: "My experience is that 99 out of every 100 cases in the accident ward of our infirmary are the result of drink."

6. The mortality among publicans and their assistants is terribly high, and the death among grocers increased 10 per cent. in the first ten years after 1860, the year in which power was given them to sell wine and beer.

7. Dr. E. Lankester, Coroner for Middlesex, in "What shall we Teach," says: "The death from alcoholic poisoning in Great Britain is prodigious; it may be set down at something like one-tenth of the whole death-rate of the country." Note that this refers to "alcoholic poisoning" only, and not to the deaths indirectly caused by drink.

8. Dr. W. B. Richardson, F.R.S., says: "I do not over-estimate the facts when I say that if such a miracle could be performed in England as a general conversion to temperance, the vitality of the nation would rise one-third in value, and this without any reference to what would indirectly follow."

creased to an extent unknown before. Drunkenness in men is bad, but drunkenness in women seems worse. It is specially abhorrent and repulsive; it removes all trace of refining influence and womanly virtue; instinctively it shocks every feeling of seemliness and propriety. The evidence given before the Committee of the House of Lords shows that the practice of secret drinking among women is assuming serious proportions and that it is extending in every direction.* The drunkenness of wives, mothers, and sisters is the last and worst development of our national vice. It may be unhesitatingly affirmed that the drinking system is *the* degenerating factor of the present time; for the whole machinery of social and moral reform is clogged by it. The highest development of individual and national greatness and the guarantee of full scope to the highest faculties of the human mind can never be attained while it continues; the energy and time of those who are most able and willing to labour for the exercise and advancement of the best powers of the nation are now almost entirely occupied in attempting to stem the tide of intemperance or in counter-acting the evils that flow from it.

Further, every man, woman, and child in the country is injured by it, whether they use the drink or not. *And this is the point.* The determination of some people not to perceive that this is the real issue, and the ingenuity they will exercise to put the case in any but the true light was strikingly manifested in an Article by Mr. Gray in the *Contemporary Review*, August, 1877. After describing "a large expanse of suburb," in which intoxicating drinks have been regularly and carefully used for fifteen years without resulting in more than one or two cases of drunkenness—a sketch for which we venture to assert the writer is entirely indebted to his imagination, for no one with any acquaintance with the home life of the middle-classes (to whom reference is made) will give the slightest credence to the suggestion that the suburb is a reality—he proceeds to urge

That any philanthropist should propose to take from that quiet suburb, containing, I dare say, 6000 or 8000 well-conducted human beings, the right to get their XB or their claret just as they do now—should propose, as a matter of legislation, mind, to take away that right just because they get drunk and commit crimes down in Rough's Alley, and the drink and the crime are often found connected—does seem to me a topic for invective, resentment, and comedy.†

"The drink and the crime are often found connected" forsooth! If the evidence of judges, magistrates, gaol chaplains, and

* Report p. xvi. 26. † *Contemporary Review*, August, 1877, p. 463.

governors is of any value : if there is any reliance to be placed on the testimony of prisoners themselves : if the experience of those of us who have given any attention to this question has not resulted in marvellous self-deception—it is a fact as conclusively proved as any social fact of which we have cognizance, that in four cases out of five drink and crime stand to each other in the relation of cause and effect. It is because the use of drink results in injury to the community in the quiet suburb as well as in Rough's Alley : it is because no one has been able to point out a single place in the country where intoxicating drinks are in common use as beverages, and where the evils we now deplore have not been attendant thereupon : it is because of this that we justify the demand that Mr. Gray's "well-conducted human beings" shall either discover some means of exercising "the right to get their XB or their claret" without necessitating injury to others, or abandon "the right" altogether.

Abstainers who touch not the drink, and moderate drinkers who take it most sparingly, are burdened and damaged by the drinking system. Equally with the drunkard they are compelled to pay a share of the cost of the pauperism, crime, insanity, and disease caused by it. Commercially they suffer from the bad trade resulting from the waste of wealth in connection with the liquor traffic. And morally they are deteriorated by unavoidable intercourse with those who are contaminated in public-houses and drinking saloons. Their liberty is curtailed by the publican's license, and they are justified in demanding protection from injury done by the habits and practices of others.

II. No system of regulating the Traffic, nor any efforts of social or moral reformers have counteracted or can ever effectually counteract the evils of intemperance so long as the sale of drink is allowed.

The history of past legislation is very instructive as to the impossibility of effectively regulating the sale, and thereby the use, of drink. During the last 300 years a vast number of Acts of Parliament have been passed with that object, and yet nothing short of total prohibition has been devised that does or can prevent drunkenness. The place has yet to be discovered where intemperance has been suppressed, and the evils flowing from the traffic avoided under any system of regulation or license. Speaking at Oxford, Lord Aberdare recently* said :

There can be no doubt whatever, in spite of beneficial Acts of Parliament, and in spite of the action outside Parliament of a large

* November 4th, 1878.

portion of the best of the community, no successful effort has yet been made to diminish that which is perhaps the greatest of our national evils, and which is beyond all question a great national curse.

The Lords' Committee also state that

All that general legislation has been hitherto able to effect has been some improvement in public order, while it has been powerless to produce any perceptible decrease of intemperance.*

In considering whether there is less intemperance now than there used to be, whether any improvement has resulted from recent legislation, and whether there has been any change for the better in the habits of the people, it must be remembered that a decrease in absolute reeling drunkenness, and better order in public-houses and in the streets, is no proof that there is less intemperance. Such conditions may be indicative of more stringent police regulations, of an improvement in the class of public-houses and in the character of those who keep them, and of a change in the habits of the people, but not necessarily of less drinking. The Lords' Committee report that

Recent legislation has had a beneficial effect throughout the country by producing good order in the streets, by abolishing the class of beer-houses, and by improving the character of licensed houses generally. *It is not, however, proved that it has diminished the amount of drunkenness.*†

They also state that

In England and Wales the number of persons apprehended for drunkenness was: in 1860, 88,361; in 1867, 100,357; in 1870, 131,870; and in 1875, 203,989.‡

*In fact, the contrary appears to be too evident. The expenditure per head of the population on intoxicating liquors increased from 2*l.* 18*s.* 6½*d.* in 1860 to 3*l.* 16*s.* 2*d.* in 1870 and 4*l.* 9*s.* 0¾*d.* in 1876: and this is, after all, the great test. Referring, however, to this increased expenditure, the Committee remark*

It is probable that a large portion represents the moderate consumption by the temperate. With increasing incomes the spending power of all classes has grown, and a higher scale of comfort has been gradually introduced. Just as the consumption of meat has increased, so has that of intoxicating liquors, but in neither of these cases does the increased general consumption necessarily imply a proportionate excess on the part of individuals.§

And they give a Table showing that the use of tea, sugar, wine, and tobacco has increased far more rapidly than the use of spirits or beer.||

* Report p. 25.
§ Report p. 10.

† Report p. 17.
|| Report p. 11.

‡ Report p. 12.

To this line of arguments and its conclusions a rejoinder may very fairly be made. Twenty years ago the people were not getting as much of the necessities and luxuries of life—tea, coffee, meat, sugar, &c.—as it was desirable they should, and the increased quantity which they have since been able to purchase represents so much more comfort and benefit to them. Mr. Caird, in his recent work on the landed interest, states that thirty years ago not more than one-third of the people of England got animal food more than once a week. Consequently there was abundant room for a large increase in consumption without any approach to excess, and the increase has been almost exclusively amongst the poorer classes. Previously, the middle and upper classes got as much tea, sugar, coffee, and meat as they required, and they will use little or no more now. Can the same be said respecting the consumption of spirits, wine, and beer? Were not the people twenty years ago getting as much as, nay, a great deal more than, was good for them? That many would have liked more than they got is evident from the increased consumption now that the country is wealthier, but was there a single case then of a person who would have been better for a drop more liquor than he got; or is any one better—happier, healthier, morally or socially better—for liquor that they get now and which they did not get then? If not—and surely no one will answer these questions in the affirmative—is it not the purest nonsense to say that “it is probable that a large portion [of the increased expenditure] represents the moderate consumption by the temperate?” If enough intoxicating liquor was used then, a great deal more than enough is used now, and that extra use must therefore be intemperate use. At any rate, it cannot “represent the moderate consumption by the temperate.”

The experience of other countries as to the futility of attempting to repress intemperance by regulating the traffic in drink is the same as our own.

The Governor of Massachusetts, U.S., in a message to the Legislature, June 27th, 1874, said :

The earliest attempts to check the use of intoxicating liquors were in the direction of license and regulation. These attempts continued in the Commonwealth for more than 200 years, with a constantly increasing stringency which can only be explained on the ground that mild measures were found to be insufficient, until in 1855 the experiment was determined upon of adopting prohibition as the only logical and effective method of dealing with the matter.

If it were allowed that *theoretically* it is possible for intoxicating drinks to be used so carefully and moderately that the evils resulting would be comparatively innocuous, the fact would still

remain that no instance of such use by any community has yet been brought to light, and that it is universally admitted that *actually* the use of these drinks is the cause of an immense proportion of human misery and sin. It is marvellous that shrewd, sensible men cannot see that they are attempting what is practically impossible. To expect men to keep sober when places are licensed purposely to sell that which makes them drunken is surely the height of infatuation.

A consideration of some of the remedies relied on will now be advisable.

Speaking of intemperance at Bradford, November 14th, 1878, Mr. Forster, M.P., said :

The only real prevention for this evil was in the self-control and self-denial of the people. He was of opinion that nothing else would really stop drunkenness, and nothing else would stop any vice, yet no law could give a man this self-control and self-denial. But was there nothing which they—the neighbours of those who got too much drink—could do to help them ? He thought they might do something in persuading them to avoid temptation, in trying to cure themselves of drinking habits, in trying to give them habits which would preserve them from temptation, in striving as best they could to lead them from temptation and deliver them from evil.

But Mr. Forster overlooks the fact that intemperance is a physical as well as a moral evil. The liquor traffic differs from every other trade. The drink creates an appetite for itself. Unlike the ordinary articles that man swallows, the more he gets the more he wants, and the further he is from being satisfied. The argument based on morality may be fully endorsed by the drinker ; he may acknowledge its accuracy and force ; he may be anxious, he may determine to abstain, but if he has not the strength of will to pass a public-house—if his appetite for drink is so strong that he cannot resist the temptations the law permits to be placed in his way, such conviction of error, and anxiety to reform (the utmost that “persuasion” can accomplish) will avail him nothing. Persuasion may do much to check the ravages of intemperance ; the thoughts and habits of the people on drinking customs have been materially modified by it. The moral suasion phase of the temperance question has been a great success—a success which, when its humble origin, and the power and bitterness of the opposition it has had to encounter are borne in mind, appears marvellous. Yet intemperance is as rife as ever, and it is evident that, much as has been done, persuasion cannot complete the work. The proper course is to *remove the temptation* ; but that cannot be done by “persuasion.” There are in every country persons who are deaf to the appeals of reason and morality ; to acquire wealth or to

indulge sensual desires is the one object of their lives. To attain it they will sacrifice everything that should be most precious. Persuasion can do but little with such men. They will pursue their evil occupations in spite of the appeals and denunciations of Christendom. Until the strong arm of the law is brought to bear upon them they will continue to curse society and contaminate their fellows. This has been clear enough when other questions were at issue—notably in connection with brothels and gambling-hells. When it was found, a few years ago, that gambling-houses were bringing ruin and disgrace on the families of the wealthy classes, the places were very speedily suppressed by an Act specially passed for the purpose. And who would now think of objecting to such a measure on the ground that “no law could give a man self-control and self-denial,” and that the proper course to take with those who were being deluded and ruined was “to try to persuade them to avoid temptation?”

Much is hoped in some quarters from a reduction in the number of liquor shops, and attempts have been made to show that, other things being equal, intemperance prevails in proportion to the number of licensed houses. The arguments in such cases have always been based on the number of convictions for drunkenness. The practices of different benches of magistrates, and the plans adopted by superintendents of police vary so much in stringency, however, that in considering the drunkenness of any particular town as compared with another, little reliance can be placed upon the number of convictions for that offence. The peculiar circumstances of each town must also be understood, its area and the number of its police, and the size and description of the “licensed houses” allowed for. Doubtless the number of such houses, other things being equal, has considerable influence on the quantity of drink consumed; and if the number in any town could be reduced by one-half at a stroke, intemperance would be lessened. But it would still exist. The drunkenness previously originated and cultivated at the suppressed houses would be partially checked, but a great deal of it would concentrate at the remaining places. Beyond the benefit realised immediately on the reduction, nothing further would be gained. That is, *drunkenness would not continue to decrease*, unless there was also a continual decrease of public-houses. It would more probably gradually increase again, until in a few years the previous condition would obtain once more. The results of the experiment in Gothenburg point in this direction. The official returns give the number of cases of drunkenness as being reduced from 2070 in 1865 to 1320 in 1868 (the “Company” began the present Gothenburg system

October 1st, 1865). After that there was no further reduction, but a gradual advance, the number of cases

In 1872	being	1581
„ 1873	„	1827
„ 1874	„	2234
„ 1875	„	2490

In 1865 there was one case of drunkenness to every 22 of the population; in 1868 it fell to 1 in every 38; but in 1874 it rose to 1 in 26, and in 1875 to 1 in 24. In Gothenburg, with 70,000 inhabitants, there are only 41 public-houses—one to every 1700 persons—surely as few as possible if the people are to be conveniently supplied at all. Yet Mr. Chamberlain reports that the town is “over-supplied with liquor.”* The moral of this is that even partial prohibition does decrease intemperance, although it by no means removes it, and that the decrease is *only temporary, and extends only so far as prohibition is adopted.*

Any reduction short of prohibition is of small *permanent* value. So long as drink can be obtained in every thoroughfare it is of little importance at how many places in the street it is sold. Legislators must learn that the drink itself is bad, that it matters not when or how it is sold, that so long as it is drunk evil effects will be produced. The nature of alcoholic liquor does not alter with the place or the time of day; it will intoxicate at noon in the most respectable hotel quite as effectually as at midnight in the lowest beer-shop.

That the Gothenburg system is an improvement on the previous arrangements in force in Sweden respecting the sale of drink is possible; but it is not very evident from the information that has yet been placed before this country. That it would be an improvement on our present licensing system (especially if its laws were enforced), or on many proposed modifications of that system—modifications which are far more feasible, and far more likely to be adopted than such a costly and uncertain remedy as Mr. Chamberlain’s—is very improbable. Nevertheless the Lords’ Committee place the following at the head of their “summary of recommendations:”

That legislative facilities should be afforded for the local adoption of the Gothenburg and of Mr. Chamberlain’s schemes, or of some modification of them.†

The advantages claimed for these schemes are :

1. Control of the local authority over the issue of licenses.

* Speech before the Committee of the Birmingham Liberal Association, November 15th, 1876, p. 13.

† Report xlv.

2. A great diminution in number, and an improvement in convenience and management of public-houses.

3. As the managers would supply ordinary refreshments, and have no pecuniary interest in pushing the sale of intoxicating drinks, the places would gradually become like eating-houses and workmen's clubs—places of harmless resort.

4. Unadulterated liquors would be sold.

5. The elimination of the influence of publicans from civic elections.

6. A diminution in intemperance, crime, and disorder, and a considerable profit devoted to the relief of the rates.*

Upon which it may be remarked, first—That these schemes are not essential in order to obtain advantages 1, 2, and 4; they are not peculiar to them, and can be brought about without the adoption of either plan. Further, the evils of adulteration are enormously exaggerated. Nothing is ever put into the liquor so poisonous and injurious as the alcohol already there. The adulteration usually resorted to is watering, thus making it less deleterious. Point 3 is of little, if any, value. It is not for lack of facilities for obtaining ordinary refreshments that people take intoxicating liquors. This is frequently given as an excuse, but, like many others of the same genus, it is used for want of a better, and another would be found were it removed. The majority of the people who frequent public-houses go for the liquor and the company. It is not that they really require "refreshment." Those who do not take intoxicating liquors require nothing either to eat or drink between meals; they are not constantly in need of being "revived" or "refreshed." If, however, being away from home, they require a meal, or a substitute for one, they have no difficulty in satisfying their wants, without drink, at any respectable restaurant, dining-room, or inn. If there is a demand for a species of "eating-houses and workmen's clubs—places of harmless resort," there should be and would be no difficulty in supplying them, independent altogether of any cumbrous licensing scheme. The value placed upon the provisoes, "that no individual should derive any profit from the sale of intoxicating drinks," is very fallacious. It is the seductive influence of the liquor itself, and the company that a man meets, far more than anything a manager or salesman can do, that induces him to continue drinking, and this would be the same under either of the new proposals. Advantage 5 would probably be counteracted by the development of new interests and influences. The sixth advantage claimed is very hypothetical, and, judging from the results at Gothenburg, already referred to, it is also highly improbable. Second, the objections

* Condensed from Report p. 24.

which the Committee mention as having been urged against the schemes would be almost insuperable.* The reply which they make to these objections, that

It would seem somewhat hard, when great communities are willing, at their own cost and hazard, to grapple with the difficulty and undertake their own purification, that the Legislature should refuse to create for them the necessary machinery, or to intrust them with the requisite powers,†

is amusingly inconsistent with their refusal to recommend the adoption of the Permissive Bill, the sole object of which is to provide that machinery and power which they here declare that "it would seem somewhat hard that the Legislature should refuse"—viz., the power "to undertake their own purification."

It has been thought—indeed, the opinion is still prevalent—that if greater facilities were afforded for obtaining lighter (*i.e.*, less intoxicating) liquors at low prices, people would drink them in place of spirits and stronger wines, and intemperance would thereby be diminished. The fallacy in this idea lies in overlooking the fact that alcohol, like all narcotics, must be taken in increasing quantities if the same effect is to be produced in the person of the taker, and consequently that a stronger liquor, or a larger quantity of the light one, is soon required; and further, that a small quantity of alcohol can create an appetite

* "Many objections, common to both schemes, and some peculiar to each of them, have been urged against them.

1. The objection felt by the extreme advocates of temperance to giving to town councils the conduct of a liquor traffic which they believe to be demoralising, and, therefore, wrong in itself.
2. The danger lest the temptation of profit might induce the town council unduly to increase the number and attractions of the drinking places.
3. The enormous preliminary expense necessarily attendant upon the acquisition of such a property; the absence of which expense not only facilitated the experiment in Sweden, but insured its profitable results.
4. The unfitness of town councils to conduct so vast a business with economy and care.
5. As regards the adoption of the Gothenburg system, the improbability that any company could be formed which would undertake to raise the necessary capital, and supply the administrative skill requisite to the conduct of such an enterprise in our great populous towns on purely philanthropic principles, and without the incentive of gain."—Report of Lords' Committee, p. 25.

The capital of the "Bolag," or company, at Gothenburg was only 11,000*l.*, of which 5700*l.* has been paid up. How much would be required to purchase all the licensed houses in any considerable town may be estimated by the reader. It would, of course, be an enormous sum.

† Report, p. 25.

for itself, and that almost every heavy drinker commenced by taking either wine or beer. Experience has also demonstrated the futility of this remedy. In the case of the Beersshops Act of 1830, and of the Wine and Spirits Acts of 1860 and 1861, the result was not only an increase in the consumption of the light liquors for which special arrangements were made, but also a very large increase in the consumption of spirits*—the direction in which there should have been a diminution, according to the arguments of the promoters of these measures.

The improvement of the dwellings and condition of the poor—making their homes clean, bright, and happy; and the education of the working classes in order to give them better tastes, are the means which many consider best adapted to combat the evil. Professor Levi, Mr. Lowe, and Sir William Gull have hopes in this direction.

Generally for the decrease of intemperance we must trust more on the advance of education among the masses, on the improvement of the dwellings of the people, and on the concurrent action of religion and morals than on any legislative provision, however benevolently intended.—(Professor Levi, letter in *Daily Telegraph*, December 25, 1876.)

If the mind is diseased, it is to the mind that the remedy must be applied. We are not wholly wanting in this respect. By a general system of education we have, we may reasonably hope, offered an alternative to the public-house, which we may fairly expect that many will adopt, and increased civilization will react upon those who grew up with few opportunities of learning.—(Right Hon. Robert Lowe, M.P., *Fortnightly Review*, January, 1877.)

I think you cannot deal with drunkenness by legislation, but I think it can be done by the better instruction of the people, by providing better houses, better means of occupation, and better amusements, and fostering better public sentiment.—(Sir William Gull, evidence before Lords' Committee, Third Report, p. 256.)

The publicans themselves point this out as the direction in which we must look with hope.† Their advocacy of a remedy is,

* Comparing the ten years before the passing of the Beersshops Act of 1830 with the ten years after, the increase in the consumption of beer was twenty-eight per cent., while the increase in the consumption of spirits was thirty-two per cent.

† Educate the masses and open free libraries for those who are sufficiently educated to avail themselves of them. Next, let the homes of the poor be looked to: their wretched, insanitary, uninviting character, and the reason for a good deal of drunkenness will be found there. We venture to say that wherever the Artisans' Dwelling Act is put in force it will prove to be one of the very best pieces of temperance legislation ever enacted.—(Statement made by the Executive Council of the Licensed Victuallers' National Defence League to the House of Lords' Committee on Intemperance, Fourth Report, p. 525.)

however, far from being a recommendation. They may, with pious unction, declare their abhorrence of intemperance and their anxiety for its diminution, but so long as they continue to deal in that which causes it; so long as they grow rich on the proceeds of a practice which is blasting bright hopes and breaking tender hearts; so long as they can take the money which in numberless instances they know is required for, and which were it not for the facilities which they and others afford for obtaining drink would be spent in, providing the necessaries of life for helpless and starving wives and children; so long as they remain in a trade which could not provide a living for one-half of those who are engaged in it if they did not regularly and continually supply drink to the intemperate, it would be hypocrisy to profess that their declaration begets feelings other than those of contempt and shame.

A word upon the improvement of dwellings. A most desirable thing; many of them are bad enough. But why are they so, and who live in them? They are occupied almost exclusively by intemperate people, and because they are intemperate. To rely upon better dwellings to make the people sober is to put the cart before the horse. *The people do not become intemperate because they live in such dwellings; they will not live in them till they are intemperate.* Put them into perfectly new cottages, fitted with all ordinary sanitary appliances, and they will very soon bring them into the same condition as the wretched places from which you brought them. On the other hand, a sober family put into one of the other places will at once renovate it from top to bottom and make it cleanly and cheerful.

The Rev. S. D. Stubbs, Vicar of St. James's, Pentonville, London, referring to the evils of overcrowding, pointed out that, "if it were not for intemperance the people would not live in such circumstances. He had laboured in London for twenty years and he had never once come across a total abstainer remaining in such unhealthy conditions."* Better dwellings will never cure intemperance: it is prevalent in the most elaborately furnished mansions; but temperance will necessitate and provide better dwellings.

Were the argument sound that it is through ignorance and lack of more intellectual methods of spending their time that people are led into drinking habits, the most highly-educated classes of society would be the most temperate, and those countries where there is the best and most general system of

* Social Science Congress, Health Department, October 29, 1878.

education would consume the least drink per head. Whereas, Professor Levi estimates that about one-third of the money expended on drink is spent by the "educated class." When we remember what a vast proportion of the people are outside that class it is obvious that the education of the upper classes does not prevent them drinking excessively. The biographies of some of the most distinguished literary and political geniuses of Britain and America present lamentable examples of the seductive influence of alcoholic liquors. Within the experience of most of us there are also cases that contradict the theory.* It has yet to be proved that the seats of learning and those who have the advantage of being trained there are remarkable for abstemiousness and sobriety. Scotland has long enjoyed a better system of education than any other part of the United Kingdom, and yet she is by no means the most temperate. Germany and Sweden are foremost on the Continent in educational matters, and yet there, as here, intemperance is a national vice of such increasing prevalence as to continually demand the serious attention of the legislature.

There may be less helpless drunkenness amongst the middle

* At Binghampton (U.S.) Inebriate Asylum, we are told that up to a certain date, 39 clergymen, 8 judges, 340 merchants, 226 physicians, and 240 gentlemen had made application for admission.

In the Report of the Convocation of Canterbury, a governor of a work-house states : "During the last few months I have had a lawyer from this town, the editor of a country newspaper, a professor of music and organist of the parish church (once a guardian), inmates of this house through drink."

Mrs. Wightman, of Shrewsbury, in her letter to the Bishop of Lichfield, April, 1863, said : "Gentlemen and ladies in different parts of the kingdom have applied to me for help on behalf of themselves or those dear to them. Thus, instances of drunkenness have come to my knowledge from the *educated classes* of society ; facts I should not have believed unless coming from the parties themselves."

Mr. Walter, M.P., chief proprietor of the *Times*, said in a public address : "If I were called upon to name those within my knowledge who have ruined their prospects in life, who have lost good situations, and have fallen from comfortable ease and competence to a state of degradation, they would not be the men belonging to the labouring class following agricultural or mechanical pursuits, but they would be men of a superior class, of good education ; men who have enjoyed comfortable homes and good salaries, and who, in spite of all, have fallen victims to that abominable and frightful vice."

Rev. R. M. Grier, Vicar of Rugeley, in his evidence before the Lords' Committee stated that he had established in his parish a house for inebriates of the upper classes, and that almost all who came to it were men of culture. He had admitted several clergymen, some gentlemen who had been in the army, and others who had nothing to do but live on their means ; and he was constantly receiving applications for admissions. (Third Report, pp. 4, 5.)

and upper classes now than formerly, but there is no evidence to justify the opinion that there is less drinking. Less drink may be taken at a sitting, but it is resorted to more frequently and regularly throughout the day. Beastly intoxication is thus avoided, but equally senseless and more injurious "soaking" is substituted for it. In considering the classes amongst whom intemperance is most prevalent, sufficient allowance is seldom made for the fact that nothing reduces a man from the upper or middle to the lowest grades of society so rapidly and so effectually as drinking. Large numbers of the most degraded characters in our populous towns have once occupied respectable social positions, and in estimating the intemperance of the various grades, these should be debited to the grade from which they fell.

Further, if past experience is any guide, the probability is, that the country will become more intemperate as it becomes better educated, unless the facilities for drinking are decreased. Not that a person is more liable to drink because he is educated. But improved education leads to greater commercial prosperity, the spending power of the people increases; and facilities and temptations to drink being afforded, more drinking and drunkenness is the result. The present generation is better educated than the last, and yet it is more intemperate. The expenditure on intoxicating drinks was in

	£		£	s.	d.
1841 . .	78,000,000	or	2	17	10 per head.
1876 . .	147,000,000	or	4	9	0 „ „

In the five years ending 1845 the Government grants for education amounted to 185,000*l.*; for the five years ending 1875 they were 7,293,000*l.* In the same time our exports increased from an average of 54,000,000*l.* to 240,000,000*l.* a year. Yet in spite of this great improvement in education and material prosperity, combined with advanced wages and shortened hours of labour and important sanitary improvements, the following statistics show that the drunkenness, criminality, and lunacy of the country increased at a terrible rate:—

	Average per year for the five years ending		
	1845.	1875.	1878.
Criminal convictions (for the same crimes)	27,901	...	54,787.
Poor and police rates	£6,217,007	...	£10,770,355.
Death rate (per 1000)	21·8	...	22·02.

There were no statistics of lunacy prior to 1852. For that year the number is given at 21,158; in 1875 it was 63,695—three times as many!

Mr. J. Chamberlain, in his speech in the House of Commons, March 13th, 1877, stated that during the fifteen previous years the total number of children in public schools had risen from

733,000 to 1,863,000. The following figures* indicate what was also going on :—

	1860.		1875.		Increase per cent.
Lunacy	38,058	...	63,695	...	67
Breaches of the peace and want of sureties.	9,154	...	21,302	...	132
Malicious and wilful damage of property	14,877	...	23,181	...	56
Deserting or neglecting to support family	3,450	...	5,953	...	72
Having no visible means of subsistence	3,090	...	5,507	...	78
Drunk and drunk and disorderly	88,561	...	203,989	...	130 !!
Population	increased				18 !!

Evidently the gigantic demoralizing agency which is at the root of this evil has not only counteracted all the efforts that have hitherto been made to cope with it, but it has also very materially extended its own power at the same time. The extent to which this has been done may be partially gathered from the following facts :—Before the passing of the Beer Act of 1830 the number of licenses for the sale of intoxicating drinks in England and Wales was 50,442.

In 1849	it was	94,135
„ 1859	„	107,463
„ 1869	„	135,720

In 1829 the licenses were one to every 270 of the population, in 1869 one to every 149.

Education, so far as it goes, is a good thing, and does, and will, exert a powerful influence. Nevertheless, with these facts before us, we are compelled to agree with the *Quarterly Reviewer* that “if every one was able to read, write, and cipher it would not make a sound public opinion. Do men gather grapes of thorns? If the drunkenness of the day be not sufficient to raise up a public opinion against itself, neither the School Board nor the Church will ever do it. Does not every drunken wretch—a coward in the street, a braggart in the tap-room, a beater of women and a starver of children—tell us in plainer terms than pen could, that if we go and do likewise we shall become like him—not to be trusted for a word he says or a thing he does?” So long as alcohol possesses the power it does, it will tend to intoxicate those who take it, and create in them an appetite for itself—a craving for more. Education will not remove or prevent intemperance, because it can neither change man’s constitution nor alter the nature of the liquor. An appetite for drink is produced by its action on man’s phy-

* Vide Pamphlet by Wm. Hoyle on “The Influence of the Drinking Customs upon the Social and Physical Well-being of the People.”

sical nature, and no training of his mental powers, nothing that is instilled into his mind, can obviate that result.

III. The total prohibition of the Liquor Traffic is essential to success in grappling with the evils of the drinking system ; it would enable the nation to abolish intemperance, and obviate the injury it does.

Without making much direct reference to total prohibition, the report of the Lords' Committee deals with it with an ingenious appearance of fairness which is apt to be misleading. The heading under which it is discussed is "The Permissive Prohibitory Liquor Bill." In addition to the local and permissive features of that measure, objection is taken to the "prohibition of sale, but of sale only, of alcoholic liquors." As this objection, if there is any force in it, would apply to an imperial, quite as much as to a local measure, it must be dealt with. The answer to it is—If the prohibition of the sale only will accomplish what is required, why do more? If the use of drink to an extent which is a national injury is the result of, or inseparably connected with, its public sale, and the prohibition of such sale will effectually curtail the use, why go further? But if gentlemen who are so anxious that our legislation should be "on a logical basis" and "sound in principle" would have scruples removed by including in any prohibitory law a clause forbidding the possession, manufacture, and importation of alcoholic liquors, the supporters of the views advocated in this article would be the last to raise serious objection to the introduction of such a clause. No indication, however, is given that prohibition would be acceptable to the Committee did it include all that they think it logically should. On the contrary, its omission from their recommendations necessitates the conclusion that it would not. Why, they do not very clearly indicate.

The statement (referring to prohibition of sale only) that "The only justification for thus singling out the one act of sale from all those by which the liquor at last reaches the consumer would be that it is necessarily, or even generally, accompanied by such evils as to demand and justify its prohibition for the sake of the public welfare"* practically grants all that the prohibitionist requires as a foundation for his argument. It may be quite true that

There can be no doubt that the great majority of those who purchase and consume liquor are not guilty of intoxication ; nor are the places where it is sold by any means so universally the scenes of drunkenness and disorder as to call for their suppression on that ground alone,

* Report p. 20.

and yet, as these are not the grounds on which the demand for prohibition is based, it by no means follows that

It does not seem, therefore, either just or expedient that the purchase and moderate use of liquor by the majority of persons should be prevented because there are some who abuse it to their own hurt or that of others.

There are far greater evils connected with the sale of drink than disorder and intoxication in the house in which it is sold. The one great evil which the Committee in this argument appear to ignore is *the use of the drink*. If there was no sale there would practically be no use. The evils of the drinking system—the pauperism, the crime, the immorality, the waste, the insanity, the disease and the death, inseparable from it—spring from the use of the liquor and its use is fostered by and depends on its sale. The sale of drink is the key-piece of the puzzle; destroy it and the whole block will drop to pieces. This question of the prohibition of sale only, or of manufacture and importation also, is a mere matter of detail. No one who is in favour of totally prohibiting the sale of drink will object to the prohibition of its manufacture and importation. He may think the latter unnecessary, believing that the prohibition of one will put an end to the other, but he will never oppose it.

Some of the objections urged by the Lords' Committee against the Permissive Bill (which it must be borne in mind is quite distinct from an Imperial measure for total prohibition) are undoubtedly weighty and difficult to controvert, but they do not apply, and are not intended to apply, to Imperial prohibition.* The real point at issue between prohibitionists and the Committee seems to be—Are the evils of the drinking system so great and so inseparable from the sale of drink as to warrant and necessitate its prohibition? It has been the object of this Article to state reasons for answering that question in the affirmative.

It remains now to consider whether the proposed remedy would be efficacious if adopted.

* No friend of Prohibition will desire to refer to the United Kingdom Alliance, and the great work that it has done during the last twenty years, in terms other than those of admiration. Nevertheless, it would be foolish, because useless, to attempt to hide the fact that the feeling is growing amongst the staunchest friends of the principles declared at its inauguration that if its adoption and advocacy of the Permissive Bill was ever wise and politic, the time has now come when it should "hark back" to its original policy, and concentrate all its energies on an endeavour "to procure the total and immediate legislative suppression of the traffic in all intoxicating liquors." The change made this year by Sir W. Lawson in bringing forward his resolution in place of the Permissive Bill was a change for the worse, and the extent to which the Alliance has identified itself with the effort is to be regretted.

In urging the objection that prohibition is impracticable—to which we have already adverted—the fact seems to be overlooked that the primary temptation to drink is the custom of society. People drink because others do. The difficulties that prohibition would place in the way of providing the drink and the disrepute into which drinking usages would fall on being practically condemned by law, would, in time, reverse public sentiment in reference to the respectability and hospitality now supposed to be connected with the provision and use of drink. As men have no natural appetite for drink,* they will not inconvenience themselves to obtain it until that appetite is formed; and as the appetite can only be created by the use of drink, when the temptations to, and facilities for, obtaining it were removed, it is very improbable that it ever would be formed. Temperance workers and others would *then* be able by means of “persuasion” to complete the work. Neither “persuasion” nor “prohibition” can alone rescue the people from the power of the drinking system. So long as the traffic exists, the facilities and temptations it offers and the customs it sustains will baffle the most strenuous efforts. On the other hand, so long as false ideas of the health-renovating and strength-restoring properties of the drink prevail, and men desire to use it, there will be unprincipled persons prepared to sell it in spite of the law, and the rigid enforcement of prohibition will be difficult. Not only must the people be convinced that the drink does harm to themselves and to the community, but the “Trade” must also be prohibited from supplying men with, and tempting them to use, that which is thus hurtful and mischievous.

When deliberately enacted in accordance with the will of the majority of the people, prohibition is practicable, and can be enforced with sufficient stringency to at once produce most marked and beneficial results. No better example of the contrast between the efficiency of regulation and prohibition can be offered than the experiments tried by the late Sir Titus Salt at Saltaire. He enforced total prohibition, and it was a great success. He then tried stringent regulation for a year. Great care was taken in selecting the houses and the men who should keep them: the sale was allowed for consumption off the premises only. Everything was done that could be to make the traffic moral and respectable, and to avoid drunkenness and profligacy. Yet the result was a miserable failure. So much so that at the end of the twelve months every public-house was closed, and the sale of drink forbidden. The former state of happiness, prosperity,

* Canon Ellison is quite in error in speaking of a desire for liquor as “a natural want” (Third Report, p. 107). A child of sober parents revolts at alcoholic liquor when offered it, and dislikes it when first induced to taste it.

and freedom from crime was soon realized, and prohibition was again a marked success. In Ireland there are two important examples of the effects of the absence of liquor shops. At Bessbrook, near Newry, where the factory of Mr. J. G. Richardson gives employment to from 3000 to 4000 hands, there is no licensed public-house, nor is there one in any of its surrounding lands. "There is no drunkenness in Bessbrook, no quarrelling, no crime, no police-station or prison, no pawnshop, no poor-house. *The operatives themselves have not two opinions on the desirability or not of having a public-house.*"

In the county Tyrone there is a district where no licensed house is allowed. Speaking at St. James's Hall, May 19th, 1870, the Rt. Hon. Lord Claud Hamilton (then M.P. for Tyrone) said :

There is a district in that county of 61 square miles, inhabited by nearly 10,000 people, having three great roads communicating with market towns, in which there are no public-houses, entirely owing to the self-action of the inhabitants. The result has been that whereas those high roads were in former times constant scenes of strife and drunkenness, necessitating the presence of a very considerable number of policemen to be located in the district, at present there is not a single policeman in that district, the poor-rates are half what they were before, and all the police and magistrates testify to the great absence of crime.

Referring to the village of White Coppice, near Chorley, Lancashire, before the House of Lords' Committee, Mr. A. E. Eccles said :

The first nine years I lived in the village we had no liquor shops, and then for seventeen years we had liquor shops, and for the last fifteen years we have been entirely without. Being young I recollect very little about the first period, but during the seventeen years we had beer shops in the village immorality was very common. I should say we had illegitimate children in every other house; but during the last fifteen years we have had only two cases of illegitimacy, and we have had only one illegitimate child born in the village, and very little drunkenness. That is a very striking contrast to the time when we had two beer shops.*

It is to America, however, that all turn to see the actual results of prohibition. There license and prohibition have had full trial, and the results are highly satisfactory. After twenty-one years' experience, empty gaols, few policemen, happiness and prosperity are the chief characteristics of those districts that have enforced prohibition. The stories told about violations of the law by visitors to the States frequently demonstrate its

* House of Lords' Committee on Intemperance, Third Report, p. 69.

general efficiency. It does not say much for the intelligence or honesty of some of our public men who have visited these States, that they spent almost the whole of their time while there in stealing round back ways and through mysterious passages to attempt to break the laws of the people whose hospitality they were enjoying, and then that they blazon their success abroad as a proof that prohibition is a failure. Unquestionably in one or two States where some form of prohibition has been adopted in advance of the opinion of the majority of the inhabitants of the large towns, or in opposition to the predilections of the authorities in those places, violations have been to some extent winked at, and the law has not been enforced with the stringency necessary to ensure universal compliance. Yet in the great majority of the towns, and throughout the country districts, the law being heartily supported by public opinion, has been strictly enforced. Even in these exceptional States the success of the law, taking the State as a whole, has been so marked that, notwithstanding the difficulty with one or two populous towns, it has been found almost impossible to make any alteration that would deprive the rest of the State of the power to prohibit.

Writing on April 24th, 1878, his Excellency the Governor of the State of Maine said :

The policy of prohibition was adopted here in 1851, and now there is no organized opposition to it in the State. After an experience of its results during more than a quarter of a century, it is acquiesced in by both political parties as beneficial to the people. The quantity of liquors smuggled into the State and sold surreptitiously is vastly less than was consumed in former years, and the law is executed easily and as well as any other of our criminal laws. I do not think the people of Maine would for any consideration go back to the old policy of license.

The City Marshal of Portland, Maine, writing at the same time, said :

Juries convict persons on trial for liquor selling, on proper testimony, as readily and promptly as for stealing or cheating, or any other crime. The law works with as little friction as any other on our Statute Books, and the more vigorously it is enforced the more satisfaction in it is expressed by the people.

Mr. James Henderson, the writer of the Article in the *Contemporary Review*, May, 1877, on "The American Liquor Laws," said, in a letter to the *Manchester Examiner and Times*, Sept. 1, 1878 :

The scepticism which is displayed by many people with respect to the enforcement of the prohibitory law I confess I cannot understand, after the experience for several years of Maine and Vermont. It is

impossible for any unprejudiced person to visit these States without being satisfied that they have attained a large measure of success. The open sale of liquor in both may be said to be entirely suppressed. There is not a public-house to be seen throughout the length and breadth of either of them. Would the Licensed Victuallers' Defence Association regard a law as impracticable and inoperative which suppressed all the public-houses in the United Kingdom? Even in Portland, in which it is acknowledged it is most difficult to suppress the sale of liquor, you may walk the streets through and see no sign whatever of it. It is idle to compare the Maine Law with the laws of this country against theft and murder; but set it side by side with our own licensing laws, and I am inclined to think it would be found to be quite as rigidly enforced and quite as honestly observed.

The experience of the American States teaches that to ensure the success of prohibition three things are essential:—

1. That the law be enacted as the expression of the will of the majority of the people, and not by a political party, adopting the measure against its convictions, merely to secure the votes of an active and influential minority who make its acceptance a *sine quâ non* of their support.

2. That the penalty exacted for breach of the law be sufficient to deter men from incurring it—that is, that it be commensurate with the profit to be derived from illicit sale.*

3. That the authorities appointed to enforce the law do their duty.

These are not special conditions. They are essential to the success of any law which interferes with the habits of the people. There are on our own Statute Book laws which are comparatively inoperative for want of them, but of which no one ventures to advocate the repeal. If a law is to be written down a failure because there are violations of it, then the Ten Commandments are a failure, and every law is a failure, and ought by parity of reasoning to be repealed. The strenuous and unceasing efforts which those who are interested in the liquor trade make to obtain the repeal of prohibitory laws is the best proof that they consider that they impose an active and crippling restraint. The following extracts from letters by Mr. Hepworth Dixon are an indication of the kind of failure that obtains in many prohibitive districts in America. Writing from St. Johnsbury, Vermont, Mr. Dixon said:

No loafer hangs about the curbstones. Not a beggar can be seen.

* The profits on the sale of drink are so large, that to fulfil this condition the penalty must be very large. Mr. D. Lewis, in his evidence before the House of Lords' Committee, February 22, 1878, said that he had known keepers of shebeens in Scotland who had paid 300*l.*, 400*l.*, and in some cases as much as 500*l.* in penalties.

No drunkard reels along the streets. You find no dirty nooks, and smell no hidden filth. There seem to be no poor. I have not seen, in two days' wandering up and down, one child in rags, one woman looking like a slut. The men are all at work, the boys and girls at school. No policeman walks the street—on ordinary days there is nothing for a policeman to do. Six constables are enrolled for duty, but the men are all at work in the scale manufactories, and only don their uniform on special days to make a little show. . . . What are the secrets of this artisan's paradise? Why is the place so clean, the people so well-housed and fed? Why are the little folks so hale in face, so smart in person, and so neat in dress? All voices, I am bound to say, reply to me, that these unusual, yet desirable, conditions in a workmen's village, spring from a strict enforcement of the law prohibiting the sale of any species of intoxicating drink. . . . I find that these intelligent craftsmen are the warmest advocates of the prohibitive liquor law. They voted for it in the outset; they have voted for it ever since. Each year of trial makes them more fanatical in its favour.*

The Hon. W. Fox, ex-Prime Minister of New Zealand, speaking in London, July, 1875, after a tour through the United States, said of the New England States :

The effect [of prohibition] on their general condition is something marvellous. A total absence, externally at all events, of all those vices and crimes which you meet with amongst drinking populations, which is very agreeable and very surprising.

In 1873 the Parliament and Senate of Canada appointed a Select Committee to inquire into the working of the Maine Law and report upon the practicability and advisability of a prohibitory law for Canada. The Committee consisted of fifteen members—seven members of Parliament and eight senators. They visited Maine and investigated, and on the 9th of May, 1873, made the following report:—

Your Committee have also to report that they have made, as far as time would permit, inquiry into the operation and effect of the prohibitory liquor law in the State of Maine. Accepting its operation there as the fairest test of its success, we find that although there are violations of the law, in many cases flagrant and glaring, yet from the evidence received and subjoined to this report, your Committee is convinced that *a prohibitory liquor law would mitigate, if not entirely remove, the evils complained of.*

The right of the people through the Government to adopt prohibition is not only undeniable on the principles of sound government, but it is already granted in the position that the Legislature has always occupied in reference to the liquor traffic. For centuries the sale of drink has been restricted and

* *Manchester Courier and Liverpool Mercury*, Nov. 14th and 21st, 1874.

controlled, and this avowedly in the interest of the people. Once grant that the principle is a just one: grant that the traffic should be restricted as far as is necessary to insure the general well-being, and the right to totally suppress it, should it be deemed essential, is admitted. To enforce the closing of public-houses for a single hour is to curtail the liberty of the subject to that extent, and the only difference beyond that is one of degree. If the trade in drink be just and right, if it be one that conduces to the happiness and prosperity of mankind, and the well-being of society, it is a trade that no people and no law will be justified in limiting or repressing. But if it is a trade the influence of which is baneful and antagonistic to the object of good government, then the nation is called upon to restrict, and, if necessary, to prohibit it. If it were possible for a Government to effectually control or limit the liquor traffic it would have been done by some Power in some country. The evil it does is incalculable, and our only hope is in its annihilation. If the nation does not destroy it, it will destroy the nation.

THOMAS P. WHITTAKER.

ART. II.—ONE GENERATION OF A NORFOLK HOUSE.

One Generation of a Norfolk House: A Contribution to Elizabethan History. By AUGUSTUS JESSOPP, D.D. Norwich: Miller and Leavins. 1878. *Second Edition.* London: Burns and Oates. 1879.

WE have seldom come across a more charming work than Dr. Jessopp's. It professes to be the history of the Walpoles in the reign of Elizabeth, when they possessed estates fifty miles in extent and were connected by marriage with the oldest families in England. The central figure is Henry Walpole, Jesuit, priest, and martyr, around whom stands a group of brothers, cousins, neighbours, all clinging to the old Faith and suffering more or less heroically for it. But the masterly historical sketch which illustrates the personal narrative brings before us the moral and social effects of the Protestant Reformation with a vividness and force which render it a truly valuable contribution to Elizabethan history. Dr. Jessopp writes in a manly and generous spirit. While he never fails in loyalty to the Church of which he is

a minister, he yet looks on the past with the eye of a true historian, and shrinks not from denouncing the crimes of those to whom he owes his present position and giving hearty sympathy to the sufferings and the heroic virtues of their victims.

We propose to make in the following pages a few remarks on the Introduction, which treats of the Reformation period before Elizabeth's accession; and then to notice the principal points in the history of the Elizabethan persecution, first in their political, and afterwards in their social aspect. We shall sometimes be obliged to differ from Dr. Jessopp. But as our criticisms will be limited to questions with which we, as Catholics, must naturally be more familiar than he can be, or which we view from the opposite side to his, they will not detract from our general appreciation of his book.

The spirit of the work appears plainly in the opening passage. Commenting on Mr. Froude's assertion, that on the death of Mary Tudor and Cardinal Pole, "the reign of the Pope in England and the reign of terror closed together," Dr. Jessopp accepts the first part of the proposition, as a loyal Anglican can scarcely fail to do. But he adds, "Whether 'the reign of terror' ended is another question, the answer to which is not to be given hastily" (p. 1).^{*} The following pages tell us plainly that the true "reign of terror" only then began.

He proceeds to give a graphic picture of the social revolution which took place during the twenty years that closed with Mary's death:—"The overwhelming character of the revolution is even now difficult to realize, impossible adequately to describe; the shock which the moral sentiments of the nation experienced has never yet been duly appreciated; its effect upon the religious tone and habits of the people can hardly be exaggerated" (p. 3). Then follows a striking description of the disorganization of society in consequence of the spoliation in the reigns of Henry and Edward. One twentieth part of the best land changed hands, and was tossed about almost at random. Above six hundred religious houses, nearly three thousand chantries, collegiate churches and hospitals, and the incalculable treasures they contained, were given over to pillage. Thousands of men and women, hundreds of gentlemen by birth and education, were cast out homeless and strange, turned adrift to live as they could, and often reduced to actual want. Industry and commerce were paralysed by the spoliation of the guilds of which in Norfolk alone nine hundred and nine were plundered, and by the cessation of pilgrimages which had circulated countless sums through the

^{*} The references are to the First Edition.

country. As to the moral effects, parsonages were bestowed on menials, the curates were the scorn of their parishioners on account of their ignorance, and cathedrals and churches were the chosen area for fights, riots, blood-shedding, pigeon-shooting, and the housing of horses and mules as in "a stable or common inn."* "The ordinary restraints of religion had been suddenly and violently torn away; the clerical police was disarmed; the pulpits were silent." Education was stopped by the closing of all the best schools; "the universities" were "menaced," "learning and literature" were "smitten with palsy." But it was in the country districts, where gaunt stone walls crumbling to ruins or sumptuous mansions untenanted greeted the eye at every turn,—in "villages to which the abbey *was* the town" and in which the hospitality and openhandedness of the Abbot were missed, that "the tremendous magnitude of the social revolution" was hourly felt. There—

In the dark chimney corner during the long dull winter evenings, . . . many an old squire, still but a little past his prime, would tell of this or that prior or monk who used to drop in in the old days and bring some relief to the monotony of their isolated lives; he would not seldom mutter his curse upon the ribald recklessness of the parvenus who had ousted their betters and made the grand old places desolate. Sometimes, too, he would sigh for a priest of the old school, into whose practised ear he might pour out his soul and seek remission of sins that pressed sorely upon his burdened conscience. How bitterly he would mourn for the "good old times," and denounce the wild havoc that had been wrought (pp. 2—8).

Such was the social state of England when Mary came to the throne. Dr. Jessopp remarks with truth, that "as yet the doctrines of the Reformers had made very little impression indeed upon the religious convictions of the people of England."† He enters with his usual good feeling into the "one long dreary disappointment" of Mary's life, and into the irritation which might naturally have been excited by the cry of "bitter hostility" that came "from over the sea," from that dastardly band of preachers, who, "safe in their Swiss asylum," "shrieked at her in language which for brutal coarseness and venomous scurrility stands unparalleled in literature," and "goading one another on to the wildest phrenzy of hatred

* Proclamation of Edward VI. Cotton. MSS. Titus, B. ii. 39. Ap. Jessopp, p. 14.

† The Catholics had recently been said to be eleven-twelfths of the nation.—Lord Paget's Letter to the Protector. Strype, Eccles. Mem., vol. ii. part 2, p. 431. Ed. Clarendon Press, 1822.

and disappointed rage," exhausted "every resource of furious rhetoric" (p. 5).

But he does not do justice to the leniency of her rule, to her aversion from shedding blood, to her self-denying financial policy, and to the rare union of piety and prudence which she displayed in the restoration of the old religion. For though three days after her accession she set an example to her subjects by having Mass sung in the chapel of the Tower, yet she left it to the nation and Parliament to legislate on the question, and allowed above two years to elapse before she took steps, remarkable for their moderation, to make restitution for the scandalous pillage of the two preceding reigns. He moreover adds, "the unhappy Queen sought for comfort, vainly, in the dark and morose fanaticism of her French and Spanish directors, and the stern persecution took its course, which slander and malice and vituperation had done much to provoke, and which her own religious melancholy aggravated" (p. 5). Justice, however, requires us to say that Dr. Jessopp merely hands down the Protestant tradition on the authority of Dr. Lingard. At the same time he draws attention to the fact, which "has been passed over quite too lightly by Protestant writers—viz., that religious persecution was no novelty on the one side or the other, that the Reformers' hands were deeply-stained in the blood of the Anabaptists;" and he claims for Mary "whatever excuse may be found for the persecution by Elizabeth" (p. 6).

Honour is due to Dr. Lingard because it was he who inaugurated the scientific study of English history. But it ought to be borne in mind that he had not the access to public records which we enjoy, and, above all, that he did not write as the apologist of his religion, nor as a mere destructive wantonly upsetting whatever displeased him; but in the true scientific spirit he accepted all generally received traditions, till he could prove them to be false.

Mary's history remains to be written from authentic records. Till this is done it is not a fit field for controversy. We trust that before long some competent Catholic will undertake the task. But meanwhile enough may be collected from Protestant writers, from Stow, Fuller, Wood, Burnett, Strype, Mackintosh, Maitland, Tytler, Strickland, and even Foxe, not only to support our estimate of her as a Queen, but to show that she was personally guiltless of the persecution, and that her clergy, whether English or foreign, were opposed to it.

The graphic description of the spirit of Elizabeth's reign, which closes the Introduction, may be taken as an answer to the question which opens it. After noticing the bitter dis-

appointment of the Catholics, when on Elizabeth's accession "their dreams of a restoration of the 'old order' were rudely dispelled," Dr. Jessopp says—"How the new Queen, with that mighty oligarchy of her council, tightened the curb, and plunged in the rowels, and laid on the lash with a heavier hand the more restive and furious the team became that she was breaking to submission,—will be illustrated, I trust, by the narrative in the following pages" (p. 9).

We now come to the second part of our task. Dr. Jessopp has brought out with great clearness the chief points of the persecution, by dividing it into four periods—viz., the first twelve years of Elizabeth's reign, the excommunication, the Jesuit, or more correctly the Seminarist invasion, and the closing years of her reign, each marked by penal laws of increasing severity. But he does not grasp the true character of Elizabeth's policy, or the extent of the persecution. He says that the refusal of the Catholics to take the oath acknowledging Elizabeth's *spiritual* supremacy "was taking offence at a word" (p. 57). He gives us to understand that Elizabeth began, or "perhaps had been driven . . . to a war of extermination" (p. 42) only after the excommunication. He asserts that "certainly when the penal laws were enacted, they were directed against the gentry almost exclusively" (*ibid.*), and that before the excommunication "it had been possible for 'good Catholics' to keep up some sort of conformity" (p. 55), or by paying a fine, which "could be paid without any great inconvenience, . . . to hold aloof from the Church services without experiencing any great pressure or suffering from much except the sense of vexation and annoyance" (p. 58). Every one of these propositions we positively deny.

Elizabeth's ruling passion was love of power. The word "spiritual," as applied to her supremacy, was not a mere word, but the assertion of the unlimited power which she intended to exercise. In virtue of this word her first public act was to require all her subjects to cut themselves off from the Church with which they and their forefathers had been in communion for well nigh a thousand years; and her second was to prohibit the worship through which an overwhelming majority of them looked for salvation, and to force on them another form of worship on her own sole authority. Dr. Jessopp says, with truth—"The Mass was felt to be and known to be the one great and precious mystery which every devout Catholic clung to with unspeakable awe and fervour, and to rob him of that was to rob him of the one thing on which his religious life depended" (p. 58). But not less precious were the Sacraments, which were the only ordinary

means through which he could hope to get forgiveness of his sins, and grace to live and to die as a good Christian. Had these statutes been obeyed, as Elizabeth of course intended they should be, the Catholic religion would have been extinct in England. Was not then the "war of extermination" waged from the very first year of her reign? Her subsequent penal laws went no further. Their aim was only to prevent the evasion, or to punish the infraction of these her first statutes.

It is evident that the early penal laws were not directed against the gentry almost exclusively. Husbandmen and artisans who were unable to pay the fines were "most cruelly and barbarously whipped in the open market-places." Others had "their ears cut off, others were burnt through the ear, and others of both sexes were contumeliously and slavishly abused."*

It was not "possible for 'good Catholics' to keep up some sort of conformity" without committing mortal sin—*i.e.*, ceasing to be "good Catholics." Immediately after the passing of the foregoing penal statutes, F. Darbyshire, nephew to Bonner, ex-Dean of St. Paul's, and later a Jesuit, was deputed by the English Catholics to ask permission of the Council of Trent to conform. The Fathers of the Council committed the question to a congregation of bishops and theologians, and in accordance with the conclusion arrived at by them, made answer to the English Catholics in the name of the Council that it was unlawful to be present at the new worship. One of the first acts of S. Pius V. was to send Dr. Sander and Dr. Harding to England to make his prohibition to be present at heretical worship generally known, with special faculties to absolve those who had fallen into schism.

Nor would Elizabeth have been satisfied by the payment of a fine. When she found that her intentions were defeated or evaded by the resignation of offices and benefices to avoid taking the oath, or by a mere formal appearance in church, she enacted more stringent laws. Catholics were now required to communicate in the Protestant Church; and as early as 1562, all Catholics, except peers, were made liable to be called on to take the oath, under pain of death if they refused it a second time.†

These penal laws were not a mere threat. All the priests who still remained in the kingdom were placed under surveillance within certain limits. The prisons were filled with

* "Dr. Allen's Answer to the Libel of English Justice," p. 174. Ap. Douay Diaries, Introduction by F. Knox, p. 81.

† Strype's "Annals," i. c. 26.

Catholics, both clergy and laity. Sir Edward and Lady Waldegrave and ten other persons were committed to the Tower for having said, or been present at Mass (p.178). Sir Edward died there on the 1st September, 1561; and Strype says of him, "His confinement here was thought to have been the cause of his death."* Strype also mentions the execution of a priest, William Blagrove, on the 10th May, 1566.†

As to the second period of the persecution, we agree with Dr. Jessopp that the excommunication was a critical point. On the one hand it was used by Elizabeth as a pretext for making death and vivisection the penalty for the performance of any act of Catholic worship, and on the other it clearly defined her spiritual relation towards Catholics. But we deny that "it was," as he says, "a blunder because it failed" (p. 41); and that the Papal advisers were ignorant "of the temper of the people" and "of the social and intellectual revolution that had been going on in England" (p. 56).

Protestants generally think that the object of the Bull was to excite a revolt of Catholics *en masse* against Elizabeth, and when this did not take place, they naturally suppose that it was a blunder and a failure. We purposely abstain from touching on the theological question. But we would draw attention to the historical fact that this was not the view taken at the time by Catholics in authority. The Bishop of Ross, Mary Stuart's chaplain, would naturally have been inclined towards the opinion most hostile to Elizabeth. But when the Earl of Southampton asked him for his opinion on the subject, he replied, "that there could be no difficulty; such Bulls must, before they could bind, be put in execution, and that depended on foreign princes, not on private individuals."‡ Ten years later Gregory XIII. confirmed this opinion in answer to the request of the Jesuits about to enter on the English mission, that he would remove all doubt on the subject.§

The Bull had, however, other important objects. It was in the first place a simple act of justice. Elizabeth at her coronation had deliberately and solemnly placed herself under the Church's jurisdiction. Her apostacy immediately after and her persecution of the religion which she had just sworn to maintain, could not be passed over without a dereliction of duty. Judgment was suspended while there was the faintest

* Strype's "Annals," i. c. 23.

† Ibid., c. 19.

‡ Murdin, 30, 40. Ap. Lingard, vol. viii. p. 58. Ed. 1841.

§ Catholicos tum demum obliget, quando publica ejusdem bullæ executio fieri potest. Facultates concessæ Rob. Personio et Edm. Campiano, 14 April, 1580. Ap. Ranke, Hist. Eng., vol. 1, i. 3, c. 4, p. 293.—Ed. Clarendon Press, 1875.

hope of a return to her duty; but now it could be no longer deferred.

The Bull was also called for on behalf of her subjects. Dr. Jessopp describes forcibly the general temper of the nation with whom material interests were predominating over spiritual; but he omits to notice the peculiar feature of its religious state. The nation had not lost its faith. An overwhelming majority was Catholic, not only in name, but with so deep and persistent a conviction, that after above a century of persecution the number of Catholics was still a cause of alarm to political and religious parties. And yet this Catholic nation allowed itself to be debarred from the practice of its religion and driven into schism and heretical communion. The fact is unparalleled in history, and the more we study it the more amazing does it seem. The explanation, however, is simple. Though the English Catholics loved their religion, they yet loved their wealth, their social position, their personal liberty and ease still more. This moral division crushed out their manliness, and made them cowardly and incapable of the firm union and resistance to which Elizabeth must have yielded.

When Dr. Allen was in England from 1562 to 1565 he found that—

Not only laymen, who believed the faith in their hearts and heard Mass at home when they could, frequented the schismatical churches and ceremonies (some even communicating in them), but many priests said Mass secretly and celebrated the heretical offices and supper in public. . . . This arose from the false persuasion that it was enough to hold the faith interiorly while obeying the Sovereign in externals, especially in singing psalms and parts of scripture in the vulgar tongue, a thing which seemed to them indifferent, and, in persons otherwise virtuous, worthy of toleration on account of the terrible rigour of the laws.

He was also obliged to demonstrate to them "the authority of the Church and Apostolic See," and "that the truth was to be found nowhere else save with us Catholics."*

The mission of Dr. Sander and Dr. Harding to England proves that S. Pius V. was aware of this state of things. Its necessary result must be the gradual dying out of the faith, as the event showed, and its corruption among the faithful. Some strong measure was imperatively called for. Dr. Allen had been blamed for "overmuch severity"† The Bull would make this impossible for the future. Elizabeth offered the Catholics the alternative of conformity or death. The Bull forced on them the higher choice between this world and

* Douay Diaries, *Intro.* p. 23.

† *Ibid.*

the next—between Hell and Heaven. Time has proved that far from being a blunder and a failure, it was an act of Apostolic wisdom and a great success. Though it increased the personal risk of the missionary and closed to him the hearts of the irreclaimably worldly, yet by stripping the circumstances of the time of their tinsel and placing them in their true supernatural light, it gave force to his words. It reclaimed the lapsed who dared not face the loss of their souls. It decided the choice of the weak and wavering, though true-hearted. Above all, it kindled the fervour which is the fruit of perfect self-surrender and taking up the Cross, and which alone could keep alive the faith. Five years after its publication, the Rev. Henry Shaw wrote to Dr. Allen:—"The number of Catholics increases so abundantly on all sides that he who almost alone holds the rudder of the State has privately admitted to one of his friends that for one staunch Catholic at the beginning of the reign there were now, he knew for certain, ten."^{*} From this time began that heroic passive resistance of martyrs and confessors who preserved the faith for us by their blood and their sufferings.

The third period of the persecution, or the Seminarist invasion, began six years before the arrival of the Jesuits. In 1574 the first four priests from the English College at Douai landed. By 1580 when Persons and Campion arrived, a hundred had entered on the mission, of whom three had won their crowns; and already had been formed that noble band of Comforters, young "gentlemen of worship and honour" (p.89), who devoted themselves to guide, protect and support priests at the risk of their own lives. Up to the close of the century there were never more than sixteen Jesuits at any one time in England, and often not more than five or six; though in 1596, as F. Holt, S.J., reports, there were about three hundred seminary, and from forty to fifty Marian priests at work. Out of 125 martyr-priests during this reign only seven were Jesuits, a fact which, as F. Knox justly remarks, "is unintelligible except on the supposition that there were very few Fathers of the Society then in England."[†]

Elizabeth's response to the Seminarist and Jesuit invasion, was a statute which increased the fine for not going to church to 20*l.* per lunar month for each person, and gave one-third of the fine to the informer. Henceforth no Catholic was safe.

An army of spies and common informers were prowling about . . . living by their wits, and feeding partly upon the terrors of others and partly upon the letter of the law. . . . They were nothing better than

^{*} Donay Diaries, Introd. p. 62.

[†] *Ibid.*, p. 64-5.

bandits protected by the law let loose upon that portion of the community which might be harried and robbed with impunity. In some cases the pursuivants after arresting their victims and appropriating their money were content to let them alone . . . in others they kept them till a ransom might come from friends; in any case there was always the fun of half-scuttling a big house and living at free quarters during a search, and the chance of securing a handsome bribe in consideration of being left unmolested for the future (p. 63).

The poor Catholics, who could not possibly pay so heavy a fine, were given over to the tender mercies of these harpies, who were empowered "to levy *discretionary* sums" on them.*

The fourth period of the persecution, dating from the destruction of the Armada, has a distinctive character. Hitherto the difficulties of Elizabeth's position abroad and at home, though chiefly of her own creation, had furnished her with a pretext for persecuting the Catholics. But now not even a pretext could possibly be found. Abroad, her great foe had thrown his last card, and lost the game. At home, the Catholics had proved their inflexible loyalty in her hour of danger. Had there been a spark of generosity or common humanity in her nature she would now have allowed them the open practice of their religion. Even good policy recommended such a course. But she took an opposite view of the position. In her eyes the security of her throne only allowed freer scope for the gratification of her fierce passions. While her subjects gave vent to their joy at the destruction of the Armada by public festivities and thanksgivings, she celebrated her triumph by human sacrifices. Between August 28th and November 29th, 1588, twenty priests, ten laymen, and one woman were executed, solely for the practice of their religion, and without even a whisper of any act of disloyalty.† During the rest of her reign the rack and the gibbet were seldom long idle. The torturing of persons with no object except to find fresh victims to satiate her bloodthirstiness, occupied herself, her friends, and her ministers. A new statute in 1591, empowering her to seize two-thirds of the estates of recusants, gave full scope for the gratification of her avarice.

Dr. Jessopp's personal narrative deals chiefly with the two last periods of the persecution which, he remarks, Protestant historians "have slurred over so carelessly," or so "curiously ignored" (Preface, p. 1). It has a double interest, because he has taken pains to show "the significance of the incidents related, and their bearing upon the history of the time" (Ibid.). We will notice a few of the characters which represent the various phases of society.

* Lingard, viii. p. 297.

† Ibid., p. 290.

First stands the missionary priest, the true hero of the reign. One of Dr. Jessopp's most brilliant sketches is that of Campion, "the most brilliant scholar in the University" of Oxford,— "conspicuous for his extraordinary readiness in debate, and for oratorical powers of a very high order." Overcome for a moment, he took the oath of supremacy. But his conscience would not let him rest, and he quitted the University. The pursuivants were let loose upon him, but after one or two narrow escapes he succeeded in crossing to Calais in 1571. When after nine years' absence he was drawn back to his native land by the hope of winning the martyr's crown, his "enthusiasm of love and self-sacrifice" quickly spread to the hearts of his hearers, and awoke "such an outburst of Catholic fervour as England had not known for many a day" (pp. 83-88).

The picture of F. Gerard, too, is very fascinating—

On the other side of Grimston Heath, in the house of [young Edward Yelverton], it was whispered that a Jesuit priest was staying as a guest. He had come none knew whence, and they scarce knew how. . . . To be sure he could hold his own with the squire in the hunting field, or slip a hawk from his wrist with the best of them; take a hand at the card table, or enjoy a seemly joke with a frolic glee that made him welcome wherever he came; but what did that flash of the dark eyes mean when the ribald tongue broke out into blasphemy or filthy language? At times how grave he was and silent; with all this gaiety and vivacity, his mind was clearly always running upon serious things. Other men talked on matters of controversy as if such themes were matters outside of themselves, he spoke with a solemn earnestness that impressed his hearers most profoundly. . . . Certainly, he was living every hour of the day, holding his life in his hand, and sure, if detected, of being dragged away to horrible torture and death. And yet he went in and out as gay and fearless as the country squires, and as much at his ease as if there were no penal law upon the Statute Book (pp. 128, 130).

In 1594 he was flung into the Tower, where he suffered tortures worse than death. But no sooner did he escape in 1597 than he returned to his duty—

Comforting the persecuted, confessing the penitent, visiting the desolate . . . administering the sacraments, though to do so was, *ipso facto*, to incur the penalty of death . . . always cheerful, fearless, and unwearied; never swerving from the path which seemed to him a path that God had marked out for him; if under a delusion and in error, yet true to his convictions and consistent in his aims—an example so far, and a reproach to most of us who think our faith so much purer than his, while our lives can bear so much less to be tried and weighed in the balance (p. 123).

Generous expressions like that just quoted are by no means

rare in Dr. Jessopp's book. His testimony to the virtues of the missionary priests, coming from an Anglican clergyman addressing Protestant readers, is very valuable; and not the less so because he cannot fully appreciate their motives. He cannot enter into their supernatural love and courage. He fails to perceive that they fought for a spiritual object which Elizabeth's terrible array of spies, jailers, rack-masters, and executioners could not touch, and that the foe whom they combated was not the Queen, but the lukewarmness of worldly Catholics. Nor does it seem ever to cross his brain that they actually succeeded in "effecting the purpose" for which Dr. Allen founded his seminary, and the Jesuits took up the mission—namely, to keep the faith alive in England till "the good time" came, not, as they fondly hoped, in the next reign, but after the weary waiting of two centuries and a half. It is therefore only natural that he should "marvel at the childish credulity," the want of "craft, cunning, or sagacity," "the astonishing ignorance of the forces arrayed against them," and the "lack of the most essential agencies for effecting their purpose," which were displayed by "these Jesuit fathers and Seminary priests, whom historians delight to represent as the varriest and wiliest of conspirators" (pp. 159-60, 217). But however much Dr. Jessopp may fail to understand these holy men, yet he never fails to treat them with fairness and generosity. His loyalty to his own creed compels him to believe that they were "under a delusion and in error," yet he leaves to his readers the doubt as to "the error or the heroism, the weakness or the nobleness, the fervour or the infatuation of such lives" as theirs (p. 54). He reminds them that—

If we can afford to smile, as we well may, at their Quixotic venture . . . we can also afford to give them some little credit for the enthusiasm which animated them, and to regard with abhorrence the ruffians whose trade it was to hunt down such victims as these, and whose boast it was to torture and slay them (p. 217).

And again—

Think of them as we will, they had no mean personal motives: they had everything to lose, in most cases they had sacrificed everything; they had nothing to gain—nothing that worldly men would value or desire. There is only one way of explaining their vehement zeal, their reckless bravery, their dauntless persistence in the cause to which they pledged themselves. Give them the credit of earnestness, and allow that they were sincere, and the history of the world can furnish us with countless parallels of the same heroic devotion in a better or a worse cause; but assume them to have been mere politicians and selfish schemers—false, cunning, and hypocritical—and these Jesuit emissaries and missionary priests, who endured so

much and who fought their grim fight so stubbornly, present us with a problem which the experience of mankind will not help us to solve (p. 162).

The position of the young Walpoles, and the circumstances which determined their future career, represent to us another phase of English society at this time. Henry Walpole was studying at Gray's Inn when Campion was executed. He stood by the scaffold; and as the martyr's quarters were flung into the cauldron the blood spurted out upon him. His heart throbbed with a new emotion. . . . "It seemed that there had come to him a call from heaven to take up the work which had been so cruelly cut short. . . . From that moment his course was determined on, and from that day he resolved to devote himself to the cause for which Campion had died" (p. 91). Within six months he escaped from England, and went to the English College at Rheims, and thence to the Jesuits. His brother Richard soon followed him to Rheims, and after a time to the Jesuits. There were still four brothers at Amner Hall. There were also three cousins—Edward Walpole, heir of Herpley, Bernard Gardiner, and Richard Cornwallis, half-brothers, and both of them sons of Anna Walpole, of Herpley. These young men had—

No future before them, and no career open, living under a ban. At any moment some emissary from the Government might knock rudely at the door; some pursuivant might come to call them to account, and press the oath upon them; some spy might report that they no longer put in an appearance at [their] parish church (p. 132). . . . It needed only a little exercise of ordinary prudence and a little worldly wisdom to secure to the Walpoles a position among the wealthiest families in the east of England; but, on the other hand, it required only a very little contumacy and a very little display of religious fanaticism to bring upon them the full force of the Government, which would not spare when there was so much to fall a prey to the spoiler (p. 112).

The young men met F. Gerard. Ere long all of them, except the eldest of the four brothers at Amner, escaped beyond sea. Thomas Walpole offered his sword to the King of Spain. All the others became priests, and the three Walpoles entered the Society. This family history is only what was then occurring in hundreds of households in England. It tells how the seminaries came to be so thronged, and what was the class of men who filled them.

Mr. Downes's history shows us another phase of English society in Elizabeth's reign. In 1561, he was sent to the Tower with Sir Edward Waldegrave. How long he remained there does not appear. In 1563 he succeeded to large estates in

Kent, Norfolk, Suffolk, and elsewhere. He took up his residence at Great Melton, built the hall, and lived in the style befitting his large fortune, till, in 1578, he was again imprisoned, as we shall hereafter narrate. For at least twenty years from this time he was a prisoner in Norwich Castle, allowed at intervals to go home to his wife and children, but liable to heavy exactions when his rents fell due, and restricted from going farther than five miles from his own hall. Each year he became more embarrassed. His Suffolk estate went first. His Kent property soon followed. At length, in 1602, he gave up his life-interest in his Melton estate for the "consideration" that he should retain the house, a few score acres of land round it, and the manor of Paunton, in Herefordshire, without being liable to any "annual rent" for his recusancy and absence from church. Dr. Jessopp says, "There is something very affecting in this man's history, and there must have been in his stubborn and immovable character some real magnanimity and heroism to submit without one moment's flinching to the wearing misery of thirty years of persecution and incessant spoliation, although by a single act of conformity he might have freed himself from all this ruinous weight of oppression" (p. 180). Yet "this man's history" was no more than that of hundreds of others of the best families in England. And "magnanimity and heroism" like his were handed down as an heirloom from generation to generation, not only of the Catholic gentry, but of families of lower degree, who now hold a high position in various branches of commerce and trade.

The history of Richard Topcliffe, a gentleman of high birth, and one of Elizabeth's intimate and trusted advisers, gives us a glimpse of the society at her Court.

He was of an old Lincolnshire family. He was the son and heir of Robert Topcliffe, of Somerly, and Margaret, daughter of Thomas Lord Borough. He married Joan, daughter of Sir Edward Willoughby, of Wollarton, co. Notts. He was born in 1532, and early came to the Court. After the Northern Rebellion he was a suitor for the lands of old Richard Norton, of Norton Conyers. Three years later he was in Burghley's pay, but in what capacity does not appear. He first came out as the "scourge and persecutor of Catholics" in 1578 (p. 63), when he seems to have already attained to the dignity of spy and informer.

In July of this year the Queen paid a visit to Cambridge, proposing to go to Long Melford in Suffolk, and to return by Cambridge, Hunts, Beds, and Bucks to Windsor. She suddenly changed her mind. The Catholics in the east were powerful, and the penal laws were not strictly enforced, as she was doubt-

less informed by Topcliffe, who was in her suite. So with her characteristic vigour she took on herself the office of High Sheriff. On the 10th August she was entertained very sumptuously at Euston Hall, near Thetford, by Mr. Edward Rookwood, who had lately come of age. The house was a small one; but the Queen had special reasons for preferring it to larger mansions in the neighbourhood. Topcliffe will describe the incidents of the visit—

This Rookewoode is a Papyste of kinde newly crept out of his layt wardeshipp. Her Ma^{ty}, by some meanes I know not, was lodged at his house, Ewston, farre unmeet for her Highness, but fitter for the blacke garde: nevertheles (the gentilman brought into her Ma^{ty}'s presence by lyke device) her excell^t Ma^{ty} gave to Rookewoode ordinary thanks for his badd house, and her fayre hand to kyss: after w^{ch} it was brayved at: But my Lo. Chamberlayn, noblye and gravely understandinge that Rookewoode was excommunicated for Papistrie, cawled him before him: demanded of him how he durst presume to attempt her reall presence, he, unfytt to accompany any Chrystyan person; forthewith sayd he was fyttter for a payre of stocks: comanded him out of the Coort, and yet to attende her Counsell's pleasure; and at Norwyche he was comytted. And, to dissyffer the gent. to the full; a peyce of plaite being missed in the Coort, and searched for in his hay house, in the hay rycke such an immaydye of o^r Lady was ther fownd, as for greatnes, for gayness, and woorkemanshipp, I did never see a matche; and, after a sort of cuntree daunces ended, in her Ma^{ty}'s sighte the idoll was sett behinde the people, who avoyded: She rather seemed a beast, raysed uppon a sudden from hell by conjewringe, than the picture for whome it had been so often and longe abused. Her Ma^{ty} comanded it to the fyre, w^{ch} in her sight by the cuntrie folks was quickly done, to her content, and unspeakable joy of every one but some one or two who had sucked of the idoll's poisoned mylke (p. 72).

Edward Rookwood was utterly beggared by fines. He was in the Fleet Prison for debt in 1619. He died in 1634, aged 79.

On the 16th August the Queen dined with Mr. Townsend and his wife, Lady Style, at Braconash, six miles from Norwich. He had conformed, but he was under suspicion because his wife had not done so and his cousin was a recusant. He, however, escaped this time. But nine of his guests were imprisoned. A mile from Norwich Mr. Downes presented her a pair of gold spurs and some verses. But he was ordered to stand aside and was committed to prison, where he remained, as we have already told, twenty years. On the 19th August she suddenly resolved "to go a hunting" in Cossey Park, the property of Lady Jernegan (Jerningham). Her husband had been a recusant; but "it would have been too shameless" to arrest her now, because the Queen owed her crown to his loyalty at her brother's

death, and Mary had given him Cossey as a reward. So she and her son escaped, though only for the present. But three days later their cousin, Mr. Bedingfield, was imprisoned, together with such of the Norfolk gentry as had not "kept their church" (pp. 61-62).

Up to this time Topcliffe had been only a spy and informer. But the Statute of 1581 opened a new field to his ambition. He now applied himself to inventing devices for entrapping priests, and he soon became known as "the arch-priestcatcher,"* and "the most unrelenting persecutor of Catholics."† We constantly meet with him in the prisons or on the scaffold, bullying and insulting prisoners, and revenging on them the failure of his attempts to shake their constancy by angrily cutting short their last prayers and hurrying on their vivisection.

When Elizabeth let loose her passions after her deliverance from the Armada, Topcliffe rose to the office of "torture master"‡ in which his genius had full scope. In 1591, we hear for the first time of what was afterwards called the "Topcliffe rack." His victim was Eustachius White, a seminary priest. After racking him several times in the usual way, he hung him up by his hands in iron manacles for eight hours, while the perspiration forced from him by the violence of the pain soaked all his clothes and ran down on the ground beneath him. But the only words he could extract from his victim were, "Lord, more pain, if Thou pleasest, and more patience." When Mr. White was taken down he said, with great sweetness, "Mr. Topcliffe, I am not angry with you for all this, but shall pray to God for your welfare and salvation." But Topcliffe answered angrily, "that he did not want the prayers of a traitor, and would have him hanged the next sessions." Mr. White replied, "Then I will pray for you, sir, at least at the foot of the gallows, for you have great need of prayers" (Challoner, No. 92).

Topcliffe so ingratiated himself into the Queen's intimacy and confidence that she corresponded directly with him. It happened that on the 26th January, 1592, the Bishop of London committed Anne, the daughter of Mr. Bellamy, of Uxenden Hall, Harrow, to the Gatehouse at Westminster as an obstinate recusant. She had hitherto been noted for piety and courage. But in this prison Topcliffe, by what terrors or violence we know not, within a few weeks overcame her virtue. He then removed her to lodgings in Holborn, where he kept her without money till he induced her, in order to pay her own expenses, to entice F. Southwell, S.J., to meet her at Uxenden. Topcliffe was "*with the Queen at Greenwich*"§ when he heard that F. Southwell

* Challoner, No. 90.

† "Jesuit Records," iii. p. 588.

‡ "Jesuit Records," iii. p. 589.

§ Ibid., i. p. 351.

was at Uxenden. But he rode off instantly, and following Anne's directions, captured him in the usual priest's hiding-place, and removed him to his own house at Westminster. The following day, June 22nd, he wrote to the Queen as follows:—

I have him here within my strong chamber in Westminster church-yard. I have made him assured for starting or hurting of himself by putting upon his arms a pair of (irons); and there, and so to keep him either from view or conference with any but Nicholas, the under keeper of the Gate house, and my boy; Nicholas being the man that caused me to take him. I send an examination of him faithfully taken, and of him foully and suspiciously answered, and for what? Knowing the nature and doings of the man, may it please your Majesty to see my simple opinion, constrained in duty to utter it. Upon this present taking of him, it is good forthwith to enforce him to answer truly and directly; and so to prove his answers true in haste; to the end that such as be deeply concerned in his treachery may not have time to start, or make shift to use any means in common prisons; either to stand upon or against the wall (which above all things exceedeth, and hurteth not) will give warning. But if your Highness' pleasure be to know any thing in his heart, to stand against the wall, his feet standing upon the ground, and his hands but as high as he can reach against the wall (like a trick at Trenchemarm), will enforce him to tell all; and the truth proved by the sequel. (1) The answer of him to the question of the Countess of Arundel. And (2) That of Father Parsons, deciphereth him. It may please your Majesty to consider, I never did take so weighty a man, if he be rightly considered. . . . And so humbly submitting myself to your Majesty's direction in this, or in any service with any hazard, I cease until I have your pleasure. Here at Westminster with my charge and ghostly father, this Monday the 22nd of June, 1592. Your Majesty's faithful servant,

RVC TOPCLYFF. *

In answer to this letter the Lords of the Council gave Topcliffe permission to torture F. Southwell to any extent short of death. No particulars of his torturing were ever fully known, except that he was hung from the wall by his hands with a sharp circle of iron round each wrist and pressing on the artery, his legs bent backwards, and his heels tied to his thighs. He was subjected ten times to this torture, which, he said, was worse than so many deaths. On one occasion Topcliffe left him hanging while he went into the city. After seven hours he seemed to be dying. Topcliffe was sent for. He took him down gently and sprinkled him with water till he revived. But as soon as he had brought up a large quantity of blood he hung him up again as before.

* Strype's "Annals," vol. iv. No. 89.

Sometimes the Commissioners were present. They said that he seemed more like a stock than a man, for nothing could be got out of him. Robert Cecil was struck with admiration at his fortitude, which he compared to that of the Romans. He said that the Father bore this torture, which was much more painful than the rack, with a firm, and even cheerful mind, and would confess nothing except that he was a priest and Jesuit, and came to England to save souls. He added that Topcliffe allowed him no rest except when he seemed to be dying, when he would take him down and bring him to by remedies; but as soon as he was quite revived he hung him up again. All this time he was so patient and his countenance was so sweet, that the servant who watched him thought he was a saint. His only exclamations were, "My God and my all!" "God gave Himself to thee; give thyself to God!" "*Deus tibi Se, tu te Deo!*"

After about eleven days he was brought before the Queen's Bench and examined. Topcliffe having denied that he had inflicted any torture on him, he exclaimed "Thou torturer, what torments have I not endured, more inhuman than any rack or scaffold? These feet upon which I can scarcely stand, these hands torn by thy iron points, that blood which still wets thy pavement—tell the leniency of thy hospitality and of thy heart!" Then baring his arms, bloody, swollen, and livid, in a half-dead but earnest voice, he disclosed a series of the most brutal tortures. All eyes being fixed on Topcliffe, he cried out, "What I have done, I have done by authority, nor do I repent it," and he drew from his breast the Privy Council's warrant. Sir Edward Coke, the Attorney-General, rejoined, "that the Jesuits were so wicked a race that it was both lawful and pious to make an example of them by inventing a new mode of torture." Thus encouraged, Topcliffe exclaimed, "That he would, if he were able, gather into one bundle all the Jesuits in the world, and consume the entire wicked race in the flames, and scatter their ashes to the winds."

The Council always had in their service some scapegoat to whose notorious cruelty anything that excited public indignation, might be attributed.* They therefore now went through the form of committing Topcliffe to prison for having exceeded his powers, though, as we have seen, they had themselves been present at the torturing. F. Southwell they removed to the Gatehouse. As he had no money he was confined with the pauper prisoners. Here he was so ill-treated,

* F. Gerard's Autobiography, p. 80, "Condition of Catholics under James I."

that when at the end of a month his father came to see him, he found him "covered with dirt, swarming with vermin, maggots crawling in his sores, his face bleared and like that of a corpse, and his bones almost protuding through his skin."* His father was so horrified at his condition that he wrote to the Queen, whose governess F. Southwell's mother had been,† begging that his son might be either put to death or treated like a gentleman. The Queen affected compassion for him and had him removed to the Tower. Here he remained, living at his father's expense, till he was taken to Newgate for his trial and his execution on the 20th February, 1595.‡

Topcliffe's imprisonment was a mere farce. His treatment of F. Southwell had secured him the confidence of the Queen and the Council, and within about a month he seems to have been granted a general "authority to torment priests in his own house in such sort as he shall think good.§ During the rest of Elizabeth's reign, the "Topcliffe rack" was generally used for torturing prisoners. An improvement on it was made by hanging up the victim by his thumbs instead of his wrists; but whether the honour of this invention is due to Topcliffe or to one of his numerous rivals in his fiendish profession, we cannot say.||

The sequel to the history of the Bellamy family throws further light on the character of this gentleman and courtier of the Elizabethan period. Anne Bellamy, when betraying F. Southwell, had stipulated that her family should not be molested. But as soon as Topcliffe had secured his prize he ignored the previous transaction. He pretended to be very angry with her for having dared to make an appointment with a priest, and removed her to the Gatehouse. On the 25th July he took her to Greenwich where he had her married to Nicholas Jones, his servant, after which he sent her to his own house in Lincolnshire, where about Christmas she gave birth to a child.¶

Meanwhile a warrant had been issued for the arrest of all the Bellamy family.** Mr. Bellamy being absent from home, escaped for a short time. Topcliffe's letter to the Lord Keeper tells us about the others—

It may please your lordship at my return out of the country this night, I did hear of Mrs. Bellamy's two daughters committed to the Gatehouse, but the old hen that hatched those chickens (the worst that ever was) is as yet at a lodging. Let her be sent to the prison there at

* "Jesuit Records," i. p. 358. † Ibid. p. 339. ‡ Ibid. pp. 349-379.

§ Bishop of Southwark's MSS. letter to Verstegan, dated 3rd August, 1592. Ap. Jessopp, p. 77.

|| "Jesuit Records," iv. p. 257. ¶ Ibid., i. p. 351. ** Ibid., p. 383.

the Gatehouse, and severed from her daughters, and her son Thomas Bellamy committed to St. Catherine's, and you shall hear proof cause enough, and see at work a strange example thereabouts. But Mr. Young, nor any other commissioner, must know that I do know thereof, or am a doer in this device: Nor by will other than his lordship that was with you when you did conclude what should be done at Greenwich last. Let them feel a day or so imprisonment, and then your lordship shall see me play the part of a true man with charity, in the end to the honour of the State. And so in haste at midnight this Friday. Your lordship's at commandment.—RYC TOPCLIFFE.

To the right honourable, my sin(gular good) lord, Sir John Puckering, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal of England.*

Topcliffe got Mrs. Bellamy into his power, and by threats compelled her to conform, as appears by the following letter, in which he tried to employ her as a decoy to her husband—

Mrs. Bellamy, it may be that I did leave you in fear the other night for the cause that fell out in your house, better known to yourself than to any of us that were there. But because I myself found you carried a duty and reverence to my Sovereign Queen and yours, and showed the fruit of obedience you know wherein, I presumed to adventure to show you more favour than like offenders unto you have had showed in like cause. And your sons and your household for your sake, for I know her Majesty's pleasure is, and so hath always been my disposition, to make a difference of offenders and offences, and between those that owe duty and perform duty to her Majesty, and such as show malice unto her in word and deed. This day I have made her privy of your faithful doings which traitorous Papists will say is faithless. You seeming to bear by this your doing a good heart smitted with a little scrupulousness, her Majesty is disposed to take better than you have deserved and I trust will be your gracious lady at my humble suit, which you shall not want without bribe and with a good conscience of my part. And therefore take no care for yourself, and for your husband so as he come to me to say somewhat to him for his good, your children are like to receive more favour so as from henceforth they continue dutiful in heart and show. And although your daughter Anne have again fallen in some folly, there is no time past but she win favour. And knowing so much of her Majesty's mercy towards you as I would wish you to deserve more and more and no way to give cause to her Majesty to cool her mercy. And so I end at my lodging in Westminster churchyard, the 30th day of June, 1592.†

Mr. Bellamy was induced to conform and was left in peace for two years, when, having refused to settle some land on his daughter Anne and her husband Jones at Topcliffe's command,

* Harleian MSS. 6988, fol. 21. Ap. "Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers," ii. p. 63.

† "P. R. O. Domestic Elizabeth," vol. cexliii. n. 26. Ap. Ibid.

he was thrown into prison for having assisted priests. When he recovered his liberty he fled to Belgium, where he spent the rest of his life in extreme poverty.*

In July, 1594, we meet with Mrs. Bellamy once more under examination. She declared that she and her two sons went to church but not to communion. Her younger son, Thomas, however declared that he would now go to communion. But her two daughters and her uncle, William Page, held firmly to their religion.† The brief record of her examination among the State Papers of this reign reveals to us the terrible struggle that was destroying the happiness and the souls of thousands of families all over England.

On the 6th December, 1593 (p. 208), Henry Walpole landed in Bridlington Bay in the company of his soldier brother Thomas and Edward Lingen, who, having been driven out of England by the penal laws, had been living for a time as a buccaneer, but had now a longing for his native land. A spy who had been in the ship with them, informed against them, and before sunset of the following day they were arrested and imprisoned in York Castle. Thomas Walpole told at once all that he knew. But Henry and Lingen were obstinately silent. Henry had even the audacity to dispute the legality of his arrest, because the law touched only priests who had been three days in England without reporting themselves, whereas he had been only one day on shore when he was arrested. There was also a difficulty about the two laymen. For though they had borne arms under the Queen's enemies, they had committed their offences beyond the sea, and there was actually no law that could touch them. These legal quibbles were a stumbling-block to the terrible Henry, Earl of Huntingdon, whose conscience had not shrunk from pressing Margaret Clitheroe to death, nor from "those dreadful massacres," which for ten years "had been relentlessly kept up," and "the details of which," as Dr. Jessopp observes, "are more revolting and shameful than those who have not given their attention to the subject or read the accounts written down at the time, could be readily brought to believe" (p. 207). He wrote to the Council on the subject, and at the end of January Topcliffe came to his aid. Topcliffe's letter to the Lord Keeper tells us the result of his examination of the prisoners. After praising Thomas Walpole's candour he says:—"By this your Lordship may show unto her Sacred Majesty how God blessed her Highness with the uttering of that which I see will turn to her high

* "Hist. Prov. Angl. Soc. Jes.," l. 5. n. 25, p. 192. Ap. Ibid. p. 64.

† "P. R. O. Dom. Eliz.," vol. cclix. n. 31. Ap. Ibid., p. 65.

service for discovering of disloyal men and women both about London, in sundry counties in England, and deeply in Ireland." He then gives a list of trinkets, &c., from exiles to their friends at home, with which Henry Walpole had been entrusted, adding, "Much more lieth hid in these two lewd persons, the Jesuit and Lingen, which wit of man giveth occasion to be suspected that labour of man *without further authority and conference than his Lordship hath here, can never be digged out.* . . . So the Jesuit and Lingen must be dealt with in *some sharp sort above*, and more will burst out than yet, or otherwise, can be known, yet see I more in this service than ever I did in any before to her Majesty's benefit both of state and purse (p. 213). This last word reminds us that Henry Walpole was heir of Amner Hall, and that the Queen loved money scarcely less than she did blood.

Topcliffe's visit to York at this time was a short one. But his advice about "further authority" and "some sharp sort" of dealing with the prisoners, went not unheeded. He returned before long, and on the 25th February started with Henry Walpole for London. During their journey, which was a very hurried one, Topcliffe gave out that his prisoner was a notorious Jesuit who was privy to a plot to assassinate the Queen, and insults and outrages added to his sufferings at every step. On his arrival in London he was placed in solitary confinement in the Tower. Here he remained for two months with mouldy straw for his bed, and barely enough food to keep up life. When such hardships might be supposed to have quite broken his spirit and shaken his courage, he was brought for examination before Sir Edward Coke, Sergeant Drewe and Topcliffe. Torture does not seem to have been applied on this occasion. But at his second examination on the 3rd May, when only Drewe and Topcliffe were present, he was hung up by his hands in iron manacles. Again and again, on subsequent days, no less than fourteen times he was hung up. In July a letter to the Council was extracted from him, in which he gave information on many points. Dr. Jessopp calls this "a painful document; painful, *i.e.*, to those who would wish to find a man who had endured so much, exhibit more heroism than in this case can be claimed for him" (p. 236). But he himself refutes the charge of want of heroism when he says, "It would, however, be an injustice to Henry Walpole to allow my readers to suppose that, even at the very worst, he betrayed any who were not already heavily compromised. A careful reading of this elaborate confession shows plainly enough that he compromises no one *at home* whose life or liberty could have been put in peril by his revelations" (*ibid.*). We are surprised that Dr. Jessopp,

who with his usual generosity makes the fullest allowance for the possible effect of intense pain on a sensitive and nervous temperament, should not perceive that this cool calculation as to the effect of his words, this deliberate restriction of speech in the midst of excruciating tortures, was in reality the highest triumph of spirit over body, and therefore true heroism. In fact, we often find that such of these Catholic martyrs as were ignorant or distrusted themselves, avoided the risk of imprudent disclosures by preserving a dogged silence, while those who had more knowledge or more perfect self-command, could venture to make reserved and harmless disclosures like those of Henry Walpole, on the chance of their tormentors being satisfied with them. In such conduct there is no failure of heroism ; for our Lord, far from requiring us to suffer without an adequate motive, bids us avoid persecution when circumstances permit. To suffer for mere suffering's sake may emulate the proud fortitude of the Pagan Roman, or the defiant endurance of the North American Indian captive, but it lacks the love and humility which are the distinctive marks of Christian heroism.

Dr. Jessopp is also shocked that Henry Walpole should declare in this paper that having seen "the errors of his ways" he is ready "to recant and conform;" that he "never allowed of the ambition of the popes or any their unjust usurpation over princes and their kingdoms;" that he is ready "to go to the church," . . . and there "preach only such doctrine as his conscience doth tell him, and the Spirit of God, to be manifestly deduced out of the Word of God;" and that "having conferred with divers learned Protestants of the clergy at York," he "did find much less difference than he thought." For such expressions Dr. Jessopp can offer or find no excuse ; and he confesses that "it is hard to get rid of the suspicion that his misery and terror had told upon him, and dragged him down to overact the craven's part." But we think that no excuse is needed for the general expression of his intention to reform his ways, or for the other ambiguous declarations which were evidently offered for his acceptance by the Council. Without reading "between the lines," as Dr. Jessopp believes to be necessary, no well-educated Catholic would "allow of the ambition of the popes or their unjust usurpation;" because history tells him that they used for the good of Christendom, and without personal aims, the power which our Lord had given them, and their just claims to which all Christians up to that century had acknowledged. No Catholic priest ever preaches any doctrine except what "his conscience and the Spirit of God tell him are manifestly deduced out of the Word of God." As to the last

point, no Catholic would scruple to acknowledge that his exaggerated opinion of the difference between the Catholic faith and Protestant doctrine had been corrected by conference with Protestants, because he would know that such an admission would not touch on his faith; since heresy and schism do not depend in the least on their greater or less divergence from the true Church, but on the simple fact that there is a divergence.

But the studied ambiguity of these expressions evidently suggested to Henry Walpole the fear that his acceptance of this declaration would be used to beguile the ignorant and wavering by his example. He therefore wrote in words which could not possibly be distorted, that "whatever he was prepared to say or do, should be 'without prejudice of the Catholic faith, which I ever profess'" (p. 237).

He must have seen as plainly as Dr. Jessopp does, that such a claim would rob his so-called recantation of all value in the eyes of his torturers. To write it then after three months of agony, and with a certainty of the consequent renewal of torture, seems to us a really heroic act. How Dr. Jessopp can call these plain words "a quibble," and how he can suspect him who thus defied his torturers, of "overacting a craven's part," we are quite unable to conceive.

But whatever differences of opinion as to Henry Walpole's conduct may exist after the lapse of three centuries, his judges took the same view of that clause as Dr. Jessopp, and we agree in thinking that he himself must have foreseen. It drew on him far worse torture than he had yet endured.

The really dreadful ordeal was still to come. In July, 1594, he was able to write. It seems that in the next few months Topcliffe was allowed to deal with him as he pleased. What he endured in that terrible time, what he revealed and what he was pressed to invent, and what they tried to make him say or do or promise, will never be known. The curtain drops upon all these horrible scenes which make us shudder as we faintly endeavour to recal them to our minds. We do know that there came a time when he lost the use of his hands altogether; and when he somewhat recovered from the effects of his torturing, his writing had become a tremulous and almost illegible scrawl. For nine long months he lay in the Tower, and no further word or whisper concerning him has survived to our time (p. 238).

In the spring he was sent back to York. On the 13th April he was tried, and on the 17th he was hanged, cut up while still alive, and quartered. The day before his execution he wrote to F. Holtby, S.J.—

I tell you nothing of all that passed during my year's detention in the Tower of London. I hold my peace, too, on many other details.

You will know them in heaven when we shall see each other again. . . . It is time for me to lay my pen aside to employ myself in prayer to the great God, for whom I am fighting the good fight, to whom I hope to be face to face to-morrow (p. 252).

Is it thus that one who was conscious of having fallen from the faith would refer to the circumstances of his fall on the eve of seeing "the great God . . . face to face?" Nay, is it not rather the first note of the triumphal song of him who knows that he has "kept the faith," and that "there is laid up for [him] a crown of justice which the Lord, the just judge, will render to him" on the morrow? (2 Tim. c. iv. v. 7).

Yet another case of almost incredible immorality must be noticed. In November, 1594, Topcliffe sued Thomas Fitzherbert for 5000*l.*, promised to him if he would persecute Fitzherbert's father and uncle to death, and also Mr. Bassett. Fitzherbert pleaded that the conditions had not been fulfilled, as his father and uncle had died naturally and Bassett was prospering. But Bassett proved that treacherous devices had been employed by Topcliffe to entrap him, and Sir Edward Coke, the Attorney-General, bore witness openly how he had sought to inform him against the parties "contrary to all equity and conscience." The case was too shameful for even those bad times, and "was put over for secret hearing." Topcliffe stuck to his claim, but losing his temper he used expressions that reflected on the Lord Keeper and some members of the Privy Council. Whereupon he was committed to the Marshalsea "*for contempt*," but no notice seems to have been taken of the peculiar circumstances of his claim. He wrote from his prison two letters to the Queen, of which Dr. Jessopp says—"Two more detestable compositions it would be difficult to find." In one of them dated "Good or evil Friday," he says—

I have helpt more traitors (to Tyburn) than all the noblemen and gentlemen of the Court, your counsellors excepted. And now by this disgrace I am in fair way and made apt to adventure my life every night to murderers, for since I was committed, wine in Westminster hath been given for joy of that news. In all prison rejoicings; and it is like that the fresh dead bones of Father Southwell at Tyburn and Father Walpole at York, executed both since Shrovetide, will dance for joy.*

One who was on terms of such familiar intimacy with his Sovereign and could do such good service had reason to expect a speedy release. "The scoundrel was out of prison again and at his old tricks in October, the restless ferocity of the man never allowing his persecuting mania to cease for an hour" (p. 64).

* Harleian MSS. us. p. 185. Ap. Jessopp, p. 64.

It would be a mistake to look on Topcliffe merely as a "monster" whose cruelties "would be absolutely incredible were it not that the evidence of even his own admission is too strong to be controverted" (p. 63). The true significance of his history is that he was only one of a numerous profession composed of "bandits protected by law" (*ibid.*), to which flocked gentlemen of birth and position, which won for its members wealth and Court favour, and in the highest department of which the Queen and her ministers personally took part. The lion's share of the heavy fine for not going to church fell to the pursuivants and informers, the third due to the poor remaining unpaid (p. 106). Topcliffe, whose surpassing villany and ferocity had placed him at the head of his profession, enjoyed the Queen's intimacy and confidence. Young, second to him alone in atrocity and the inventor of the instrument of torture called "Young's fiddle," was made Justice of the Peace; while Wade, who tortured Nicholas Owen, the Jesuit lay-brother, to death under circumstances of preternatural barbarity, was selected to be Secretary of the Council, and rose to be Governor of the Tower. The Queen's ministers and law officers assisted at the hideous mysteries of the torture-chamber; and as torture was forbidden by the law of the land, each case of its infliction was her direct act, by virtue of the prerogative of dispensing with the laws which she claimed.

This almost incredible demoralization of the highest classes unavoidably spread to the lower orders, whom they employed as assistants and who had their due share of the spoil. It was a strange Nemesis of the penal laws which fostered and developed it. But it may be traced back to "the shock which the moral sentiment" and "the religious tone and habits" of the nation experienced through the sudden and violent tearing away of "the ordinary restraints of religion" by "the utter break up of the ancient ecclesiastical institutions of the kingdom" (p. 3). It is a striking commentary on Dr. Jessopp's sketch of the overwhelming revolution which ushered in Elizabeth's reign. No more direct answer could possibly be given to his opening question—"Whether the reign of terror ended with the death of Mary Tudor and Cardinal Pole?"

ART. III.—ORIGEN AGAINST CELSUS.

1. Origenis *Contra Celsum*, Libri I., II., III., IV. Recensvit et cum delectu notarum edidit Wilhelmus Selwyn, S.T.P., Regiæ majestati a sacris, Dominiæ Margaretæ in sacra Theologia Lector, Coll. Div. Joann. olim Socio. Cantabrigiæ: Deighton, Bell et Soc. Londini: Bell et Filii. 1876.
2. Origenis *Contra Celsum Libri octo. Ejusdem Philocalia.* Gulielmus Spencerus, Cantabrigiensis, Coll. Trin. Soc. utriusque operis versionem recognovit, et Annotationes adjecit. Cantabrigiæ. 1658.

THE value of one of the great documents of history which have descended to us from remote times may be measured by the regret we should feel if it were missing, or by the curiosity there would be shown if it could be announced as a discovery, as a treasure rescued from a papyrus-roll or a palimpsest. The works of the early Christian apologists, and particularly the treatise of Origen against Celsus, one of the most voluminous and interesting among them, are examples of this remark, as throwing so vivid a light on the most stupendous revolution that ever happened in the world: a revolution still operating, and to close only with the duration of time, but of the history of which in its earlier stages fragments only remain. It is not the object of the present article to give a *résumé* of the modern researches connected with the celebrated treatise we have named, but rather to review the work itself, as if it had first fallen into our hands, and to give the unlearned reader some idea of the importance of its contents, which, in ecclesiastical histories, even the more elaborate, are scarcely summarised in the detail which they deserve.

The work which Origen answers in the eight books of the *Contra Celsum* was a studied and copious argument against the Christian religion, composed under the ambitious title of *Lógos Alethés*, or "True Discourse," by Celsus, a philosopher whom Origen often charges with being an Epicurean, but who, from various passages quoted from his work, would seem to have inclined to Platonism, or at least to have borrowed from Platonism and from Stoicism as well, in the superficial manner common to brilliant writers, who are ready to pick up a weapon wherever they find it. This Celsus (there was an earlier one in Nero's time) lived in the period of the Antonines (say about

A.D. 140), and was therefore distant from the dawn of Christianity by about the length of time that separates us from the reign of George II. He seems to have been acquainted with Christianity, not from sources that could give him any real idea of it, but from its external aspect as viewed by a world that feared and hated it, and despised it too, so far as contempt is consistent with those other feelings; further, from the reading of the Scriptures "without note or comment," as the Alexandrine literati had them to refer to in the version of the LXX.; and we know what strange ideas externs and "laymen" outside of any art and profession may derive from turning over documentary evidence without any traditionary voice to explain it. He has poured into his "True Discourse" whatever notions he had gathered from whatever quarter, and we have in it, or at least in the faithful extracts supplied by Origen, the table-talk against Christianity that might have been heard at Greek and Roman banquets, the discussions of the lecture-rooms or the porticoes, and the eager objections also which had made their way from the schools of the Rabbis to those of the philosophers. At best, it was a sterile and inefficient assault, the memory of which is preserved only in the answer to it; just as in the world of literature, we should never have heard of Boyle but for Bentley. Yet in an age when the rusty weapons of infidelity are refurbishing up, and being re-hung in its armoury, it may be instructive to observe how they flashed in the arena sixteen centuries ago, and were foiled as they will be again; not to mention that the combat is in itself interesting, as part of the history of the Church, in which false doctrines—pagan, or heretical, or infidel—hold the place that hostilities and rebellions do in that of the world.

In attempting, then, a review of this treatise, we shall take the objections of Celsus, and their refutation by Origen, in the following order:—(1) The secrecy ascribed to Christianity as a society, and (2) as a dogma; (3) the principle of faith (and here we shall exhibit the great leading evidences alleged by Origen); (4) attacks on Christianity as originating in "faction;" (5) attacks on its supposed divisions; (6) the notion of its not essentially differing from beliefs previously held; (7) the question of altars and images in the controversy, and of the *cultus* of angels; (8) ascription of our Lord's miracles to magic; (9) parallelism from classical legends and Egyptian ritual; (10) moral superiority of the Christian Church; (11) insulting comparisons instituted by Celsus; (12) their connection with Platonic theories; (13) objections to the great facts of revelation; (14) Origen's character as a controversialist.

I. In the very front of the hostile array of Celsus stands the

well-known charge, that the Christians form secret covenants with each other, contrary to the law, and, which is another branch of the same accusation, that "the dogma" is secret. The world at large, though probably few great houses were without inhabitants who acknowledged themselves Christians, seems to have had as vague impressions of what Christianity really meant as ordinary Europeans of the present day distant from Russia have of the signification of "Nihilism." In another part of his treatise Celsus had urged the same objection in a more concrete form, and in combination with other grounds of dislike. In the very curious passage to which we refer,* he talked of the underhand ways of the Christian teachers, describing them as people of a low class, workers in wool, shoemakers, fullers, and such-like, who in private houses get influence over the young and set them against their parents, filling their minds with wild ideas about the happiness which would be the consequence of accepting their doctrines; silent in the presence of superior persons, but enticing their thoughtless auditors to follow them into the women's apartments, or the shoemaker's shop, or the laundry, where they could preach without fear of interruption. To understand this, it should be remarked that in the houses of the great most of the trades necessary for domestic life were carried on by slaves on the premises of their masters. There might be hundreds of slaves in one residence, and parts of the house would of course be set aside for their occupation. Christianity at first, as we know from Scripture, could return few of the rich or noble among its adherents. St. Paul himself earned his bread as a tent-maker. Many of the converts were slaves, and such were found even in the imperial palace. This great fact of slavery coloured the whole of social life, and the most superficial reader must be struck by the extreme frequency with which servitude of various kinds is alluded to in the parables of our Lord. A religion which adapted itself so tenderly to suffering of all sorts, and which especially sympathised with that of servitude, which it ennobled and exalted, could not but be eagerly caught up by this vast and lowest stratum of mankind; and its "dogma" would be "secret," not necessarily because anything in it was held in reserve, but simply from the want of communication between the lordly and the servile class, and the incapacity and disinclination of the former to enter into anything which interested the latter. Against Celsus' objection that the Christians form illegal covenants with each other, the Christian apologist justifies such covenants by comparing them with the associations formed by civilised people who find them-

* *Contra Celsum*, iii. p. 144, ed. Spencer.

selves dwelling among barbarous nations like the Scythians, where laws prevail that are contrary to right; and does not hesitate further to defend the Christian combinations by the parallel of secret societies, formed where tyrants overturn the covenants which lie at the foundation of States. Such societies presented an analogy to the case of bonds and covenants made to resist the laws of the devil's tyranny, and for the salvation of all who can be persuaded to revolt from him, as from the laws of barbarians or unholy despots.

II. All this quite establishes the general aspect of secrecy which the pagans imagined they saw in this action of the Kingdom of God which was forming among them. To what extent, however, was it really secret, either as an organisation or a dogma? Origen certainly in one clear passage denies that the dogma, by which of course is meant Christian doctrine in general, could fairly be called secret, unless indeed, as the logicians would say, *per accidens*. He remarks as follows:—

Next, as he (Celsus) often calls the dogma "secret," in this, too, we must refute him, nearly all the world being better acquainted with the preaching of the Christians than it is with the opinions of the philosophers; for who is ignorant of the birth of Christ from a Virgin; and of the Crucified, and of His Resurrection, which is believed among many, and of the judgment which is proclaimed, chastising the sinners according to their deserts, and rewarding the just? nay, even the mystery of the Resurrection being known, is talked of, though laughed at by the infidels. It is quite absurd to say that in these points the doctrine is secret; but that there are some things that follow them which are esoteric, and do not get out among the multitude, is not peculiar to the Word of the Christians alone, but belongs also to the philosophers, among whom there were some discourses exoteric and others esoteric.—*Contra Celsum*, i. p. 7.

The study of this treatise on the whole would lead us to the conclusion that Origen, in speaking of the esoteric doctrines of Christianity, had in view not so much a *disciplina arcani*, as the phrase is commonly understood—that is, a discipline keeping in reserve certain doctrines forming part of the body of traditions, but which were not to be generally communicated, as interpretations of the more mysterious passages of Scripture, prophecies, parables, recondite and abstruse ideas only to be judged of by deep theological students. He does, however, describe a graduated system of Christian doctrine in the case of catechumens; and the reserve he shows on the subject of the Holy Eucharist is very remarkable.*

* See particularly *Contra Celsum*, viii. p. 416, ed. Spencer:—ἔστι δὲ καὶ σύμβολον ἡμῶν τῆς πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εὐχαριστίας, ἄρτος εὐχαριστίας καλούμενος.

III. There is no charge urged by Celsus that appears to touch his great antagonist so to the quick as that in which he ascribes to Christianity the principle of unreasoning faith and a partiality to ignorance, none which he takes more trouble to answer or to explain. Celsus urges this objection as emphatically as any infidel or Protestant, and precisely in their sense.

It is worth while to quote his words. He says—

Some desire neither to render nor to accept a reason for what they believe, using the maxim, "Examine not, but believe," and "Thy faith will save thee." [They say] "Believe that He to whom I am introducing thee is the Son of God, though He was bound in the most degrading manner, or most shamefully punished, though knocked about, but as yesterday, in the eyes of all men, most outrageously. For that reason, believe it all the more." Some of them bring in one guide, others another; but common and ready to the hand of all of them is the saying, "Believe, if thou wilt be saved, or go thy way." What shall those do who really wish to be saved? Shall they fling up dice and divine whither they are to turn, or whom they are to join?—*Contra Celsum*, vi. p. 282.

Origen answers this objection with great fulness and force, though with an unnecessary concession to the false principle which underlies it. He begins by admitting that if it was possible for mankind generally to devote their time to philosophising, that would be the best method to adopt, and that the more recondite aspects of the Christian revelation would afford plenty of scope for it; but that, as very few have the leisure required for such pursuits, what better means could have been devised under such a state of things than to subdue men's minds by faith in the divine system of rewards and punishments, without waiting for the tardy examination of reason? Faith, he contends, following the principle of analogy, is what holds society together. Men marry, they bring up families, they undertake long voyages, they sow the earth, in the confidence, often far from resting on grounds that could of themselves produce certainty, that these great steps will turn out favourably. And in the field of speculation even, something of the same kind might be observed. The schools of philosophy, one or other of which every educated Greek or Roman of that day took as the guide of life, appealed, indeed, to reason to prove their conclusions; but what led each thinker, at the outset of life, to close with one or other, to announce himself as Academic, or Peripatetic, or Stoic, or Epicurean? Grounds that would seem very partial and imperfect, compared with the elaborate theories to which these schools would introduce him. The accident of locality, perhaps,

* *Contra Celsum*, i. p. 10.

or an inclination which the learner never thought of analysing, would determine his first but all-important step. If one is satisfied thus to close with the leader of a sect, how much rather with God, and with Him who teaches that He alone is to be worshipped? It is a favourite argument with Origen to point to the actual results which witnessed to the efficiency of this instrument in working a change among mankind. Was it *better* that the great multitude of believers who had emerged out of the deluge of vice in which they once wallowed should have their characters subdued by unreasoning faith in the punishments and the rewards which are held out to sin and to well-doing, or not to close with the truth till they could give themselves up to a rational investigation? A thoughtful mind would not think that the success of a physician in restoring many sick people to health was obtained without the Divine favour; such a blessing did not happen ἀθεῖ—how much more the success of Him who healed and converted and bettered the souls of many, and made them depend upon Almighty God, and taught them to refer every action to His pleasure, and to avoid everything, down to the smallest word or thought or deed that was displeasing to Him? He speaks from his own experience as a religious teacher of the utility of this principle, and acknowledges that he had taught many to believe, independently of reasoning, who were not able to relinquish their practical pursuits, and devote themselves, as we should say, to controversy. The following passage is remarkable:—

Though Celsus and his Jew may laugh to scorn what I am going to say, still it shall be said. Many, *as though against their will*, have come to Christianity, some spirit of a sudden turning the governing principle of their minds, with an overwhelming force, from hatred of the Word to a readiness to die for it, and having appeared to them in vision or in dream; for we have known many such instances; which if we write, we ourselves having been present, and witnesses of them, we shall be met with loud laughter on the part of the infidels, who imagine that, like those whom they suppose to have invented these things, we too forge them.—*Contra Celsum*, i. p. 35.

So far, then, we have, as evidences upon which Origen relied, the great patent fact of Christianity, which had spread over the earth and was found in all lands, almost before men were aware of its existence; and, secondly, the great and wonderful change it had wrought in the minds of those who had accepted it, producing a marked character, powerfully in contrast with that which reigned in the world previously. This character was gentle, subdued, humble, pure, qualities but faintly anticipated in the philosophy of Paganism, yet brought out with ease, and on a scale and extent hitherto unknown. Another important branch

of the great apologetic system which Origen had in his mind, was the fact of the persecutions which had been sustained by the first and later Christians in spreading the faith through the world. This is the fragment of Origen's argument out of which Paley has formed the very foundation of his treatise on the "Evidences of Christianity," just as another fragment contains the nucleus of Butler's "Analogy of Religion." The former is summarised in the following words:—" [The disciples] displayed the sincerity of their feelings towards Jesus by enduring anything whatsoever because of His words. Such endurance and resolution even unto death they took up, with a disposition of mind that did not forge lies concerning their Master; and, to fair-minded persons, a very clear proof of their having been persuaded of the truth of what they wrote, is that they endured so many and such great sufferings for the sake of Him whom they believed to be the Son of God" (ii. p. 65). It will be perceived from the tone of this passage that persecution was not, at the time when it was written, the condition under which the Christian Church was placed. There had been, for a long time, a pause and lull in the storm, so much so that Origen looks back to the days of persecution much as we do to the period of the penal laws, and speculates on the motives that might have led the great enemy of the Church to refrain from affording her children such opportunities of displaying the heroic fortitude of the faith. He anticipated, however, that this repose might very soon again be disturbed, as was in fact the case a very few years later, by the terrible persecution under Decius.

A third great evidence was found by Origen in what he calls the *ἵχνη*, or traces and vestiges of miraculous agency which still existed in the Church. In one sense, the age of miracles had vanished—that is, of those miracles the certainty and simplicity of which, as well as their stupendous magnitude, belonged to a primitive epoch; analogous, as regards the Church and the Divine action, to the physical forces which operated in the beginnings of the material universe. But in another sense, miraculous processes of a less assured kind, convincing, indeed, to the mind of faith, but which hover on the confines where the natural and supernatural come in contact—answers to prayer—*χαρισματα*—*grazie*, these are continually exhibited; and sometimes miraculous phenomena more startling. A fourth branch of the Origenian evidence is prophecy and its fulfilment. This had great influence upon his mind, and this, too, his unscrupulous opponent made great efforts to bring down. The great and culminating argument in this division (always reserving an unapproachable place to those relating to

the Incarnation, Life, Death, and Resurrection of our Lord) was the destruction of Jerusalem, following with such appalling significance in so brief a space of time, less than the ordinary duration of a man's life, the great and crowning act of national guilt committed by the Jews in crucifying our Lord.

IV. We proceed to consider a different and larger exhibition of the opening objection of Celsus, already described. To Greek writers on subjects connected with political society, there was no idea more familiar than that of *faction*; no evils to which they were more keenly alive, from the traditions of their State histories, than those caused by men's banding together and forming associations independent of the community. Greek political orthodoxy regards the State or governing Power as all in all, and it was essential to the perfection of its ideal that there should be no thinking and acting independently of the organised body, but that the whole State should act as one man: yet to this very ideal was due an opposite result. Every city was torn asunder by factions, each of which sought to make its own principles exclusively prevail, and some have been ready to banish or massacre all who were opposed to them, and in their turn to constitute a policy as intolerant as that which they overturned. The revolutions which brought all the regions washed by the Mediterranean waters under one sovereign intensified rather than abated the disposition to regard the State as all in all, and to abhor the notion of men separating off into States within the State, into associations unrecognised by the law, and in their turn hostile to it. Public writers then naturally saw in the polity of Christianity such a faction and such a factious spirit. But Celsus went far back even beyond the cradle of Christianity, and maintained that Judaism, the parent stock of Christianity, itself originated in a *στάσις*. He sought to show that the original source of Jewish nationality was the migration of a faction from Egypt, which had quitted its native soil from that quarrelsome self-willed character which was represented in its descendants obstinately preferring their own ways to those of the State. Christianity, he contended, had parted asunder from Judaism, as the Jews had broken off from the Egyptians, and in its turn, after the unanimity of its early days, when it could reckon but few adherents, had split up into many factions—that is, the heresies having but one thing in common, the Christian name. The paucity of numbers, here incidentally taken for granted by Celsus, is denied by Origen. The Christians at the beginning were of course few as compared with the multitudes that afterwards floated in, but not few absolutely, for it was the crowds that followed Jesus into the desert that excited the jealousy of the Jews against Him, and

led them to plot against His life. But passing over that question, how had Christianity about it the marks of faction? The answer that seems first to have occurred to the mind of Origen is characteristically suggested by the most prominent of the attributes connected with faction in the mind of antiquity. The readers of Thucydides and Xenophon need not be reminded that nothing belonged to it more essentially than a reckless indifference to shedding blood. Had Christianity arisen out of faction, "the legislator of the Christians" could never have absolutely forbidden taking man's life, or reproved the attempt on human life made by His own disciples (alluding to St. Peter's use of the sword). In the same spirit Origen elsewhere assumes that it is unlawful for Christians to serve in the army, and not merely on the ground of the sinfulness of sharing in an unjust war. It is an example of the manner in which an expositor who of all others would insist on the principle of interpreting Scripture by the spirit and not the letter, has erred by seeking a formal law in a case which our Lord made use of to show the temper in which His true followers should meet injustice. In substance, however, the answer is sound. It comes to this: that Christianity converted the world by persuasion and not by force, and it is easy to read in that sense the words of Origen without accepting the Quaker-like inference they convey, which could be disposed of not only by the authority of the Church, but by examples such as that of Cornelius in the Acts of the Apostles, who we do not find quitted his post in the Roman army when he became a Christian. To return to Celsus: in the same spirit in which he accuses the Christians of originating in faction, he says, "If all men should desire to be Christians, these people would not wish their conversion any longer." Even at that early stage we see anticipated occasional complaints that Catholics form a clique and are addicted to exclusive ways of living. Origen's answer to this also is instructive and interesting, as to the state of Christian "propagandism" and the position of Christians in society at that period. It is not often he speaks with the indignant emphasis he here exhibits:

That such a statement is *a lie*, is plain from the fact that Christians, so far as depends on themselves, neglect not the sowing of the Word everywhere in the world (*τῆς οἰκουμένης*); some, at any rate, have made it their business to go forth round about not only cities, but villages and farmsteads, that they may also settle others in piety towards God. And one could not say they do this for the sake of wealth, since at times they do not even receive what is required for their sustenance. Now, when through the multitude of those who come to the faith, rich people, and some in dignified positions, and ladies of family and fashion favour the servants of the Word, perhaps

some one will venture to say that it is for the sake of a little glory that certain persons support the Christian doctrine : yet it is impossible to suspect this reasonably at the beginning, when the danger, especially to the teachers, was great. And now the discredit with the rest of the world is greater than the glory supposed to be reaped among those who think with us, and that not by all.—*Contra Celsum*, iii. p. 116.

V. We have seen that Celsus regarded heresies as the normal state of Christianity, as showing that spirit of faction and opposition out of which it in his view arose, and to which it was ever tending. Origen's manner of disposing of this objection is very peculiar, and, it must be said, requires a very favourable construction to reconcile it with faith. He denies the fact that the Christians were unanimous at the outset. There were great differences as to what books were to be accepted among the Scriptures, and no small question, even whilst the Apostles were still preaching and the eye-witnesses of Jesus were still teaching His doctrine, as to the obligation of the Jewish customs. Some held that the Resurrection was already over, some disputed whether the day of the Lord was at hand or not, and St. Paul's caution to avoid "the profane novelties of words and oppositions of knowledge falsely so-called," showed that there were variations even when the faithful were as yet few in numbers. The undeniable fact of the swarm of heresies that infested the world soon after Apostolic times he disposes of, not by the equally patent fact which is to be obtained even from this treatise, of one acknowledged Christian society, the Church diffused over the world, and incapable of error, but by contending that αἵρεσις were always sure to arise on all subjects that were useful to mankind. Thus there were sects in the profession of medicine, and sects in the study of philosophy ; it need not therefore be matter of surprise if there were sects in Christianity. It will be perceived that, using the word "heresies" in the beginning of this paragraph, we write it Greek in what follows, and this is to note the fallacy into which Origen falls in his use of the word. The word αἵρεσις, as applied to different schools in the profession of medicine, implied nothing that was unreasonable. There is no authority in that, or any other mere human branch of knowledge, from which it is any sin to differ. Empirics (using the word in its primitive sense, which meant no disparagement) among the ancient physicians, homœopaths in our own day, might divide the medical world without offence. And even in philosophy, one αἵρεσις, as such, had as much claim to be accepted as another, none of them pretending to any other source than the unassisted human reason. But Origen must have been well aware that αἵρεσις carried with it, in Christianity,

marks of condemnation which it did not and could not in the field of human thought. He omits here to refer to the text, "a man that is a heretic after the first and second admonition avoid," or to the enumeration of heresies among "the works of flesh," but says that St. Paul seems to him to have spoken admirably when he told the Corinthians: *Oportet et hæreses esse, ut et qui probati sunt, manifesti fiant in vobis*, and argues from the advantage the physician or philosopher would derive from studying the views of the various sects in their respective provinces, to the conclusion that "he who has diligently looked into the αἱρέσεις of Judaism and Christianity would become the wisest Christian." The drift of his reasoning here would seem to take αἱρέσεις, not as so many sinful habits, though in the field of the intellect, but as "guesses at truth," of a nature that would make them instructive, even though erroneous.

It is not to be denied that a line of argument like this is *male sonans*, although an apologetic view may be taken of it, founded on the fact that all heresies may be considered as imperfect, and therefore positively deceptive statements of some truth in the Christian system, which, if insulated from the rest, is sure to become false doctrine. Thus, insist on Christ's human nature alone, and you become Arian, or Ebionite, or Unitarian. But we may explain Origen's reasoning upon general grounds, without supposing him thus indifferent to the first elements of a Catholic Christian's habitude of mind. It must be remembered that he is pleading a cause against an opponent who admits of no appeal but to the human reason. To attempt to silence Celsus by the authority of the Church would have been what the conditions of the duel, if we may use the expression, would not admit; and the Christian apologist therefore is often tempted to place his argument in a light which will recommend it to those who would judge upon the principles of his adversary. It is in fact "the lowest ground" on which disputants like Butler and Paley proceed, and may be compared to the reasoning by which Stoical philosophers like Seneca, and Chrysippus before him, endeavoured to show, that even on the lines of those sects which made pleasure the supreme end, the happy life could still only be attained by virtue. But independently of such general considerations, there occurs enough incidentally in this treatise to prove that Origen, however he might think it necessary to keep this principle of faith in reserve, nay, however his natural constitution of mind might be called heretical, as all constitutions have in them a bias towards some form of evil, though this is the most fatal, still desired to submit to the authority of the Church. We proceed to present a few passages that appear in point.

We find Origen arguing as follows:—"Granted that there are those among us who deny the identity of [our] God and the God of the Jews; but those at any rate are not to be accused who demonstrate from the same Scripture that the God of Jews and Gentiles is the same." So far, perhaps, the Protestant disputant would urge that he appeals to Scripture alone. But observe the next paragraph:—"Granted there is a third class consisting of those who style some persons as 'of the soul,' others as 'of the spirit' [ψυχικούς and πνευματικούς, implying a distinction predestinating them to eternal loss or to salvation], and I suppose he means the Valentinians. Well, what is this to us, *who are of the Church*, who accuse those who introduce natures that from their constitution are to be saved, or from their constitution to be lost?" And further on:—"Granted there be those who receive Jesus, as boasting thereby to be Christians, but who still desire to live also according to the law of the Jews, like the multitudes of the Jews (and these are the two sets of Ebionites, either confessing, like us, Jesus born of the Virgin or that He was not so born, but as the rest of mankind), what charge does this import against *those of the Church*, whom Celsus has styled those of the multitude?" (v. p. 272). So, in reasoning on the doctrine of the Resurrection, he says:—"We, persuaded that that which is sowed is not quickened, except it die, &c., observe both *the mind* (βούλημα) *of the Church of Christ*, and the greatness of the promise" (v. p. 246). Again, in noticing certain wild fancies of the heretics, which Celsus had ascribed to Christianity, he remarks:—"Celsus does not understand *the doctrines delivered by the Church* [τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας], which very few are trained to comprehend who have devoted all their lives according to the command of Jesus to searching the Scriptures" (vi. p. 300). These passages are quite sufficient to show that, although for the purposes of this treatise, wisely or unwisely, Origen does not make the authority of the Church a prominent element in the controversy, it lies at the foundation of his mind. We say this, remembering also passages like the following:—"Divine Wisdom then, being different from faith, is the first of what are called the graces (χαρίσματα) of God; and second after it, to those who know how to be exact in such matters, is what is called Knowledge; and the third (since the simpler sort too must be saved, who approach the worship of God according to their ability) is Faith" (vi. p. 284). There seems nothing here that might not be understood in the sense in which St. Thomas speaks of the possibility of some things which are of faith to the unlearned, being matters of knowledge to the deep theologian, though certainly the habit of faith is not parted with, when a special vision is accorded to the intellect.

VI. We have hinted that a reply of a more general nature to this immediate difficulty may be obtained from a line of argument which he uses in reference to an important objection of his adversary's. The reader will remember the famous stanza in Pope's "Universal Prayer," so little in keeping with the character of a professed Catholic as he was who wrote it :—

Father of all, in every age,
In every clime adored ;
By saint, by savage and by sage,
Jehovah, Jove, or Lord.

Well, this sentiment is identical with a view put forth by Celsus, to show that the Mosaic revelation concerning the nature and attributes of God contained nothing that differed essentially from what was already known to the world. The shepherds and goatherds who followed Moses, he said, held that there was one God, calling this Universe by the name of the Most High, or Adonai, or Sabaoth, or whatever appellation they pleased, and knew nothing beyond that. It made no difference whether the Supreme God was called by the usual name among the Greeks, Jews, or such and such a name among the Indians, or such and such among the Egyptians. Origen takes the far deeper view, that names are not such a matter of indifference as his infidel antagonist assumed they were. There were three theories current in the ancient schools as to the origin of names—that is, of language. Aristotle held that names were arbitrary and conventional—*θέσει*, that is, *ex instituto*, to use the familiar phrase in Aldrich ; the Stoics, that they were natural—*φύσει*, that is, imitative ; the Epicureans also referred them to nature, but in a different sense, not as imitative of things, but as spontaneously uttered by the first men, and called into existence by the impact of objects on their senses and minds. Origen derives names, at least of the sacred character attaching to those above mentioned, not from any association with accidental and material objects, but from "a secret theology depending on the Creator of the universe"—that is, he holds that primarily they were given to man by revelation. To confound the revealed names of the Almighty with those apparently analogous names supplied by Paganism would be like giving the Name of God to lifeless matter ; or again, in ethics, the name of good and of the *honestum* to wealth, or bodily well-being, or nobility of birth. In proof of the mysterious depth and efficacy of names, he urges the power which the name of Jesus had, in countless instances, displayed of banishing demons from the possessed ; and Christian martyrs showed their feeling for the principle it involves, in refusing, at the cost of their lives, to give the *name* of God to Jupiter. And he saw a confirmation of this essential

importance of names in the fact to which he more than once adverts, that in magical incantations it was found that names operative in one language lost their power if translated into another; invocations became inefficient if the sounds were varied.

VII. Origen, then, is strongly impressed with the dangerous confusion of thought caused by imagining that the *names* of various objects of worship express no essential difference, or that they can be with safety interchanged. We might with advantage, in certain branches of allied controversy, reverse his argument in this way: We can neither safely assume that different names, in different religions or sects, stand for the same objects, nor yet that the same apparent idea, or the same apparent practice in different religions and sects and ages, is identical or to be regarded as equivalent. We use the principle here broadly stated to meet a difficulty which appears on the very surface of this treatise. We allude to the well-known fact that Celsus accuses the Christians of having neither temples nor altars nor images, and that Origen boldly accepts the charge, and gives reasons why the Christians had none of these things. The bearing of this double argument on the controversy with Protestants is obvious. It admits of being met upon different grounds, and differently too with reference to the various classes of disputants who may urge it. For Anglican controversialists of whatever shade, and for most modern Protestants in different degrees, the argument would certainly prove a great deal too much. It would disallow of any use of devotional pictures; it would sweep away altars, and churches with them. On the other hand, strange as it may seem to have been thus broadly and emphatically put, the argument is at variance with known facts, such as the statue of our Lord at Cæsarea, mentioned by Eusebius, the representations on the religious objects found in the catacombs, and the whole drift of patristic theology. We should prefer, however, to answer it on the more general principle we have indicated, and which we proceed to develop. It is known that in chemistry the same elements in different combinations have totally different powers, and what, in one compound, may be harmless or beneficial, in another is poisonous. This may help us to understand the widely-different force of allied or even identical thoughts and actions according to their place in different and hostile systems.

The offence of idolatry consisted in the rendering to the creature the honour due to the Creator, and this might be exhibited in various ways. The great general characteristic in all seems in fact to be the elevation by the human imagina-

tion of something, whether real or fantastic, into the rank of an independent cause from which good or evil may come, irrespective of Almighty God. The presentation of such a cause by the imagination to the worship of the will is idolatry, whether exhibited in the form of an external picture or image, or not. If, however, the danger of transferring to the creature the incommunicable honour of the Creator be absolutely absent, the use of representations in worship becomes a thing indifferent, depending for its lawfulness on the same authority which throughout a whole dispensation forbade it. There has always been in the world an authority to declare religious truth and to govern religious usage. We do not conceal the fact that the pagans advanced much the same argument to justify some of the forms of idolatry we have enumerated as we should apply in defending the *cultus* of the saints and the reverence paid to holy images—viz., that the honour done to these inferior objects of worship was a relative one, having ultimate reference to the Most High, which is to be found among the arguments given from Celsus by Origen. But this is easily met by the answer that the Supreme God of Celsus is not the God of Christianity, or at any rate is so distorted by the false medium through which he is seen, as to deprive the pagan reasoner of such appeal; and finally, that, without exception, the inferior objects of pagan devotion had no claim even to relative worship. Origen was right in appealing to a prohibition of the use of images, so far as the custom of the Church of that day forbade it; but though this has been changed, idolatry is still, as ever, forbidden upon grounds that must always hold good.

In this, as in many other questions of doctrine and discipline, the study of such an author as Origen can hardly fail to lead a student who holds the first principle of faith and authority to the acceptance of a prudent and measured theory of development. We find ourselves plunged as it were into a world where all our familiar ideas are to be found, but found energizing in an inchoate state, some of them invisible except to the practised eye, some present indeed, but as yet in apparent conflict with the rest. "The seeds of things" are there, but "which will grow and which will not," individual Christians could not have pronounced with articulate belief. Such a theory might be largely illustrated by Origen's whole teaching on the subject of the Godhead and Sonship of our Blessed Lord and His Incarnation. He almost exhausts the powers of the language in His praise, and yet somehow just falls short of the fulness with which in less than a century the Church enunciated the idea. This is an evident anxiety to restrain the superlative exaltation of the Deity of the Son, which was not needed, when all had

fallen into its place, and the ὁμοούσιον had crowned and sealed the Church's doctrine on that point. There being, however, no conscious, intentional hostility to the full truth, the teaching of a great Christian thinker at that early stage remains, in spite of its inevitable imperfections, a κρῖμα ἐς ἄσι. Take another illustration, and upon a point disputed by many who do not dream of questioning the ὁμοούσιον—the invocation of angels. Origen distinctly rejects it. Its utility had not yet been enunciated as of faith. His point of view was such as to incline him to keep it in the background. But yet, in the midst of pages that are quite auriferous to the student who hunts the patristic writings for scraps that read like Protestantism, we find that there is still, behind all his disclaimers, a sense of devotion towards the holy angels that was but as it were waiting the moment for expansion. Celsus had said: "From our adoring, with God, His Son, it follows that according to us [the Christians] not God only, but His ministers are worshipped." In replying to this, Origen thus guards himself:

If he had meant those who are truly ministers of God after the Only-Begotten of God, Gabriel, Michael, and the other angels and arch-angels, and had said these ought to be worshipped; perhaps, purifying his expression concerning worship and the acts of the worshippers, we might, as arguing on things so great, have stated such views on the subject as our capacity allowed us to form regarding it; but now, when he holds the demons adored by the Gentiles to be ministering spirits, he does not bring us to accept his conclusion as to worshipping such as them, whom the Word declares to be ministers of the Evil one, and of the prince of this world, who makes those whom he can to revolt from God.—*Contra Celsum*, viii. p. 386.

The argument of the apologist is entirely directed against the *pagan* notions. He cannot allow the slightest admission that could be turned in favour of worshipping the demons, or any worship of angels which Christianity could sanction to be brought, in kind or degree, into the same category with the other.

VIII. The great principle of total distinctness of idea and essence, in spite of all outward resemblance, pervades Origen's treatment of the subject of the miracles. It was a prominent argument of Celsus that the miracles of our Lord were effected by magic, and it is remarkable that he should have recourse to this argument rather than to any attempt to deny their truth. He mentions as commonly exhibited in the market-places for a few pence, marvels by performers who had learned them from the Egyptians, and who expelled demons from the possessed, drove away diseases by exsufflation, raised the souls of heroes,

displayed costly banquets on tables, and dainties and viands that were unreal, but all manifest to appearance.* We imagine that we are reading about the phenomena that puzzled the world recently in the case of Mr. Home, or those, now forgotten, of which so curious an account is given in Wraxall's "Memoirs" as having upset the common sense of infidel courtiers at Berlin in the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Still more extraordinary are facts, real or pretended, which Celsus relates of the oracles of Æsculapius still going on in the third century of the Christian era.† The god was believed visibly and palpably to appear to those who consulted him, again reminding us, only in a form more complete, of the manifestation of hands which was such a favourite part of Mr. Home's exhibitions. The acknowledged occurrence of such strange effects in the pagan world were to Origen but an argument for the corresponding effects in Christianity. "It seems to me," he says, "that we ought to state this as applicable universally, that when there is something worse which affects to be homogeneous with something better, there must needs be found something better on the opposite side;" and the mere outward resemblance was no ground for supposing that the cause of the two was identical, just as in Nature there are species radically distinct, though superficially alike. The effects of the two classes of miracles proved an essential difference between them. None of the magicians who did the extraordinary feats above-mentioned invited the spectators thereby to correct their moral character, or trained them in the fear of God, or sought to persuade them so to live as to be justified by God. They neither did these things, nor could do them, nor even wished to do them, being themselves full of the most shameful and infamous sins. Now the miracles of Jesus were directed to the bettering of those who witnessed them, and to induce His disciples to teach men according to the will of God, that the rest of the world, learning more from His word and character than from these marvels, might refer all their actions to please Almighty God. How, then, could His miracles be reasonably placed on the same footing with those of the pagan enchanter?

IX. The same principle is used in meeting phenomena urged by Celsus as parallel to the Resurrection of Jesus. They are mostly vague stories, culled from Herodotus and Plutarch, such as those of the apparitions of Aristæas and Cleomedes; and as to these Paganism made no claim for any moral effect produced by them upon the world. It is upon similar grounds that Origen argues for the antecedent probability that there

* *Contra Celsum*, i. p. 53.

† *Ibid.*, iii. p. 124.

would be prophecies in a revealed system like Judaism. The Gentiles had their oracles, and the appetency of man to look into the future would not be left without a supply in a religion coming from God, analogous to that which Paganism had anticipated.* Origen thereupon is quite prepared to allow there was in Gentile thought and practice much that resembled revealed truth, and finds no difficulty in the fact. His opponent had eagerly used it on the side of Paganism, and places early in the list of his arguments that Christianity and Judaism, not merely in the material proofs by which it was recommended but as a system, in its doctrines and practices, had each borrowed from the religions which it announced itself as superseding. It contained, he said, nothing new, but was a remoulding of old λόγοι, long familiar to the world. It was to be expected that the Egyptian religion, with its imposing antiquity, elaborate mythology, splendid ritual, and early relation to Judaism, would be called in to assist this part of the objector's reasoning, yet not much is made of this topic. He commenced, however, with the following singular illustration:—

He wants (says Origen) to compare our faith with the Egyptian practices. Among them, one is met, on approaching, by splendid precincts and groves, and great and beautiful gateways, and marvellous temples, and magnificent pavilions all around, and very religious and mysterious forms of worship. But now on entering and getting further within there is seen receiving adoration a cat, or a monkey, or a crocodile, or a goat, or a dog. . . . [The Christians] laugh at the Egyptians, though they offer many not contemptible enigmas, when they teach that such things are honour done to eternal ideas, and not, as the many think, to animals that have but ephemeral existence. But they are simple, when they introduce in their discussion about Jesus things in nowise more serious than the goats and dogs among the Egyptians.—*Contra Celsum*, iv. p. 120.

The scornful, bitter, and blasphemous style of this objection should not make us neglect to remark the aspect in which Christianity must have presented itself to an objector who could use this language. Evidently it appeared to him, in spite of all his clamour against its supposed patronage of ignorance, a vast and complicated system of thought—such a system as could only be hindered by temporary circumstances from being represented to the external eye by a ritual system not less imposing. Origen's reply to this branch of his opponent's argument appeals to the deep and mystical teaching, the wisdom taught to the perfect in the Christian system, and challenges him to interpret the Epistles of St. Paul, naming those addressed to the Ephesians, Colossians,

* *Contra Celsum*, i. p. 28.

Thessalonians, Philippians, and Romans. This reply, however to the point as to the last-mentioned objection, still does not account for the impression which the outward aspect of Christianity had evidently produced upon Celsus, judging from the passage we have quoted, and which the apologist leaves unnoticed.

Although Celsus does not appear to have alleged that Christianity, as such, borrowed ideas from the Egyptian religion, he did pretend that the Jewish rite of circumcision came from Egypt, the Egyptians and Colchians having had it before the Israelites (i. p. 17). He pointed also to the Egyptian laws of abstinence from certain kinds of flesh as a proof that the Jewish prohibition of pork was not a peculiar institution. Origen answers the objection as to circumcision at first by remarking that it rests on Celsus' preferring Egyptian testimony to Jewish, but afterwards more elaborately upon the principle as now already stated—viz., that the Egyptian and Colchian circumcision differed essentially from the Jewish in the purpose, law, and intention of the circumciser, which made the rite a different thing in the respective cases, to which he adds the circumcision of the Ismaelite Arabs, which the Jews distinguished from that of Judaism, notwithstanding that Ismael was circumcised along with Abraham. He goes off, however, into suggestions of a kind highly characteristic of his style of thought, and where a modern controversialist could not profitably follow him, throwing out the idea that the rite was performed by way of protection against an angel hostile to the race of the Jews, and able to injure those of them who were uncircumcised, but powerless as against the circumcised, and that all his power over those who were circumcised in this religion was overthrown by the Incarnation and Circumcision of Jesus. This strange view would require to be illustrated by other passages where Origen sets forth his ideas concerning the office of angels in the administration of the world. Thus, he treats the subjection of the Jews to the Assyrians and Babylonians, not merely as their reduction under the dominion of those nations, but as their being handed over to be chastised by the ἀρχόντες, by the ruling angels of the same, their own ἀρχων permitting it for a time, that, as if avenging himself, he might get authority to draw out of those other nations such subjects as he could, give them laws and ordain them a rule of life to bring them to the end to which otherwise those would have attained, who had originally been committed to him. The above ideas, for instance, look much like the notion of regarding our Blessed Lord as an æon, a being of the angelic type, however ineffably exalted, rather than as God of One Substance with the Father ;

although in their misty light one could not make out with certainty that he means to allude to our Lord at all.

The pagan objector brings the resemblance he imagines himself to trace between the ideas of Christianity and those of Greek heathenism into greater relief than he does its supposed borrowings from the doctrines or rites found among the Egyptians. In the first place, he contends that certain of the histories of the Old Testament are merely reproductions of the familiar legends of Greek mythology; for example, that the history of Noe was borrowed from that of Deucalion; that the Tower of Babel was a distorted recollection of the war of the Aloidae against the gods; and that the burning of the cities of the Plain represented the conflagration which punished the presumption of Phaethon; and again, having recourse to philosophical notions, that the final judgment in which the sins of the world will be condemned to everlasting fire, had been suggested by the alternate physical revolutions of the universe, in which deluges have been succeeded by the destructive action of the fiery element; and he scoffs at the idea of the Almighty descending like a torturer, wielding fire for the punishment of the offenders. These objections are met by Origen, partly on the fact that the writings of Moses were long anterior to those of the authors from whom come the poetic legends referred to; and, so far as regards the last-mentioned theory, by an argument to show that the final destruction by fire is to be understood, not in a material, but a figurative way, the wood, hay, stubble, of which the Apostle speaks, being plainly figurative, and therefore, he urges, the fire which is to consume them should also be so interpreted. Here, too, he speaks with much reserve, but his reasoning, as before, is unsatisfactory, and, as addressed to an infidel, imprudent.

In the same spirit, Celsus argued that in worshipping their Lord, Who was made captive and Who died, the Christians only acted like the Getæ who worshipped Zamolxis; the Cilicians, Mopsus; the Acarnanians, Amphiloehus; the Thebans, Amphiaraus; and the Lebadeans, Trophonius; to which list he was not ashamed to add the worship which had been established in Egypt to Antinous, the vile favourite of the Emperor Hadrian, and confirmed, as was said, at Antinopolis, the seat of that strange idolatry, by vengeance with which the deified Antinous visited those who had offended him. This parallelism is partly met by Origen with distinctions of which we have already stated the difficulty and the probable explanation—viz., that the Christians erected neither temples nor statues in honour of Jesus, as the heathen did to those objects of their idolatry. We may add to what has been said, that Origen

seems to fall here into language very doubtful as to orthodoxy, observing that He is "midway between the nature of the Unbegotten and that of all begotten beings" (iii. p. 131). He goes on to propose a dilemma to his opponent: either these demons, or gods or heroes, had no existence, and put forth no power at the abodes sacred to them at Lebadea, Thebes, and elsewhere (and if he thought so, he was an Epicurean, and his defence of the pagan religion was inconsistent and false), or else they did exist and were what he pretended. In the latter case, he admitted that Jesus had also been able to make multitudes believe that He came from God; and if so, that He was stronger than the beings among whom Celsus had numbered Him. For they tolerated the worship of others. He, as confident in His superior might, forbade them to be received, as being wicked demons who had taken places on the earth into their possession, because they could not touch a region purer and more divine, where the coarse defilements, "the smoke and stir of this dim spot," could not make their way. Once more, Origen seems not to have sufficiently grasped the essential difference, unapproachable and beyond all thought of comparison, between Jesus and the heroes of the pagan world, and, he might have added, the saints. An admission that placed Him on their level, or even inconceivably higher and stronger, was as nothing; and the clearness and energy with which every Catholic must feel this, is only one among the proofs of the supreme injustice of charging the Bride of Christ with idolatry. When Origen said, she erected neither temples nor statues to Him, he was right, if he meant, as he must be taken to mean, no temples and no statues in the sense in which either term was understood by the pagans who surrounded him; no temples like Delphi, where some earth-loving demon was supposed to haunt, whom primitive Christianity regarded with the feeling with which the modern world would think of a ghoul or a vampire; no statues, representing either "nothing in the world" or beings only hostile alike to God and man, or objects regarded as having in themselves any principle or power apart from, and independent of the Creator. But temples there already were, where the Unbloody Sacrifice was offered, which the heathen only heard of in wild and fantastic fancies; and statues there either were, or were soon to be permitted to the faithful, raising their minds by their holy symbolism to the God of gods, and to His servants whom He has called Gods in a sense relative and limited, He, whose eternal and infinite greatness no created thing can approach, not even the universe itself, that *Kosmos* which, but for revelation, men might have been pardoned for imagining to be divine.

To consider another form of parallelism, which Celsus drew between the worship of the deified men of heathenism and that of Christ, he asked, why should Æsculapius, or Dionysus, or Hercules, after they had put off their mortal flesh, not be regarded as gods rather than Jesus? The answer is very obvious to all whose conscience had not been dulled by the general depravity of the pagan world. Origen demands: "What was there that Æsculapius, or Dionysus, or Hercules did of such magnitude as to deserve it? Or whom could they show that had been bettered as to their moral character, and become more elevated by their sayings or their lives, that these men should become gods? We may read the numerous tales about them, and see whether they were clear from licentiousness, or injustice, or folly, or cowardice; and if nothing of the sort were found in them, then Celsus' argument might be strong, where it places the above-mentioned on the same level with Jesus."* We see, again, that the apologist takes lower ground than he need, or than is desirable. The fabled lives, indeed, of Hercules and the others named were such as he says, but had they been like those of Socrates or Marcus Aurelius, Celsus' argument could not have been more valid. Indeed, in another place, Celsus does put Epictetus and those like him in contrast with our Lord, giving, as was natural for him to do, the preference to the former. The two ideas of heathen pride and Christian humility are totally distinct and incommensurable, and the preference for the latter, and the perception of the moral viciousness of the former, must in the end be decided by Divine grace acting on the soul; though men will judge differently in youth, strength, wealth, and prosperity, than they do when in weakness and affliction; and though, happily for the world, it is too much overspread with sorrow for the bulk of mankind not to be forced to recognise the grand proof of Christianity which is found in its results, as they are seen on the great field of human society.

X. This latter argument is often pressed by Origen with great power. As to miracles, strange performances are talked of in heathen tradition attaching to names of which little otherwise was known. But what had these men done? And what was there to show why miraculous powers should be supposed to have energized in them? "The note of sanctity" indeed, to use the terminology of later Catholic theology, is one of his strongest points. A remarkable example of this is to be found in the third book, where he contrasts the demeanour of the Christian Churches of Athens, Corinth, and Alexandria, and of

* *Contra Celsum*, iii. p. 136.

their councils, with that of the assemblies and the councils of those pagan cities respectively; the conduct of the members of a Christian congregation with the wild passions of the Athenian *démos*, which still, under Roman domination, was permitted to hold its assemblies, doubtless as fickle and unprincipled as ever they were, however shorn of their power. Of what restored Corinth was, we can form an idea from the stormy scene through which St. Paul passed there before the tribunal of the Proconsul; and as for Alexandria, Paris in the days of the Revolution was not more frantic than the Alexandrian mob could show itself. He then passes on to the ecclesiastical magistrates and princes—that is, the priests and the bishops—and contrasts their life with that of the rulers in the city hostile to that of God; and he does this in a tone that shows an assured conviction, in which all who heard him would share.*

Before quitting this part of the subject, we would remark that it is important to remember that the primitive idea of the word *ἐκκλησία* carries with it the idea of *authority*. The *ecclesia* in a Greek State was as supreme as our Parliament, each citizen being his own representative. It constituted a final court of appeal. Whatever other ideas might be dropped or altered when this word became part of the language of Christianity the attribute of authority certainly remained, which can be traced, as we have seen, even in Origen and in his adversary, where he speaks of the *μεγάλη ἐκκλησία*, “the great *ecclesia*,”—that is, the whole congregation of Christ’s faithful, not found in this or that city, but dispersed throughout the world.

XI. In passing on to review another class of objections, we are struck by a special difficulty in the controversy with infidels, especially of the Gentile and pagan type; we mean that each objection includes in it several false principles and assumptions, which would almost require a treatise to disentangle, and renders it, on the one hand, almost impossible to treat any one objection singly, or, on the other, to avoid repetitions. The following insolent and extravagant passage is an example in point:—

Ridiculing, after his fashion, the race of the Jews and Christians, he [Celsus] has compared them all to a cluster of bats, or to ants coming out of a nest, or to frogs congregated about a marsh, and disputing with each other who among them are the most sinful, and saying that God foretells and forewarns us of everything; and that leaving the whole universe and the heavenly orbit, and all this vast earth, he dwells with us alone, and sends messages by heralds to us alone, and ceases not to find and to seek how we may be ever with

* *Contra Celsum*, iii. p. 128.

them. Again, they [the Jews and Christians] are like worms who should say that there is a God, and that they are come next him, born of him and like in all things to God; and all things have been made subject to us, earth and water, and air and the stars, and all things are because of us, and are ordained to serve us. But now, since some of us have offended, God will come, or will send his Son, that he may burn up the unjust, and that we who remain may have everlasting life with him. "These things," says Celsus, "we must tolerate from worms or frogs, or Jews or Christians, disputing with each other." —*Contra Celsum*, iv. p. 175.

The coarse and insolent mannerism of this passage would please vulgar and superficial minds. It is answered by Origen with that temper, and at the same time with that severity of tone, which it demands. If the comparison is to be understood to apply to men in general, it is an absurd one, because reason gives man a superiority over the brute creation, though they may surpass him in bulk or other bodily attributes; and, comparing the soul of man with that of brutes, the same reason, and the capacity for virtue which still remains even in the vilest men, places them at an immeasurable elevation over the brutes. And if Celsus meant his comparison for Jews and Christians alone, is it a fit one to make, remembering what has been effected by the Christian religion in enabling men's souls to ascend above all created things to God alone, and to do all things as in His sight and hearing? And if that be insufficient to rescue them from this insulting comparison, consider the mastery which Christianity has given over passions which find the minds of most men weak and yielding as wax. Are the possessors of such heroic virtue the brethren of worms, the kinsfolk of ants and of frogs? And can those who dwell in the brightness of justice and humanity and gentleness be fairly likened to a cluster of bats? Above all, ought this to be said of those who have learned that the body of the rational being is the temple of the God whom they worship, and who take care not to defile the temple of God by unlawful indulgences? As to the other vices which prevailed among mankind, and even among so-called philosophers, he contends they were not found at all among Christians, "or at any rate not among those who join the congregations and go to the common prayers, and are not shut out from them, unless such a person may very rarely be found hidden among the crowd." Such reasoning as this, full of passionate conviction, shows that the Christians of that day must have been visibly superior in morals to the heathen who surrounded them, and that they had a severe discipline by which the morality was maintained. And we affirm the same argument will still hold good, if applied, as

Origen applies it, to those who are Catholics in reality, and not in name. We should exclude therefore the crowds who, in most European countries, scarcely even keep up the outward profession of religion. We point, for example, to the moral purity of the Catholic population of Ireland, taken as a whole, which even our enemies will not dispute.

XII. The insulting similitude which we have just been considering does not stand alone, but is essentially connected with the theory concerning the nature of the universe, which Celsus had learned from Plato. He held that God was not the author of the material world which is subject to destruction, but only of the world of souls which is not liable to death. The material world had come from spontaneous generation, as life from different sorts of corruption (of which the fancy of bees being engendered from the putrefaction of the body of an ox, described in Virgil's "*Georgics*," is only one out of several of the same kind). Man, as a material being, did not differ from the lower animals; and as to the rational soul, he argued from the instinct of the brute creation, of which he alleged many fanciful illustrations after the unscientific manner of the age, that the latter did not differ from man's reason; moreover, that, in certain respects, brutes are even more favoured by the gods than man, such as their support not being gained by toil; their being supplied with weapons by Nature, and by these weapons often overpowering man; and their prescience of the future, shown in augury. He directed all these ideas against the Mosaic doctrine of creation, and the view that the material world was created for the service of man. And with this theory his view of the origin and nature of evil coincided. He held that evil was attached to matter; that it did not prevail more at one time than another; that the course of things had been, was, and always would be the same, things coming in appointed revolutions; that evil, after all, was but partial good, or tending some way or other to good in its consequences.

We can only briefly summarize the lines of thought upon which Origen meets these hostile views. Against the notion that God was not the author of matter, he throws out the idea which others have worked out in detail, as the great argument from design, or, as he calls it, *art*. It was incumbent on Celsus, in the presence of all the art exhibited in the material universe, to prove that this could not have come from a creative Mind, or a creative Mind distributing to various demiurgic agents their respective provinces. Then, as to spontaneous generation, he, too, sharing in the spirit of his age which seldom thought of testing assertions by actual and well-arranged experiments, accepts the idle stories about bees being

bred of the putrefaction of the ox, wasps from that of the horse, and so on, but sees in them symbols of the conceivability of death's ushering the soul of man into a further state of being, which he might have better illustrated by other and real transformations in Nature. That the material substances, *quæ* matter, were identical, he answers by a sort of *argumentum ad hominem*; it would follow from hence that the heavenly bodies, which all the heathen regarded as Divine, were not higher in Nature than the lowest of the organisms which surround us. The instinct of animals in all its strange manifestations he regards as intended to teach men so many moral lessons; and as to certain wonderful fables of that class which Celsus had alleged, Origen, again without venturing positively to contradict them, at least offers the just and important principle, that each species of animal is limited to one such faculty, however extraordinary, and age after age is incapable of developing it further. To the argument founded on augury, he gives, as we might expect from the hold which that delusion had upon the ancient world, an elaborate answer, partly founded on the absurdity of supposing the animals capable of giving warnings to man, whilst unable to foresee their own fates; partly on the supposition that these omens might be directed by demons for the purpose of increasing their power over the human race, for which he rather finds a presumption in the fact that the animals of augury (for by no means all animals were supposed to be significant of the future) were among those classed as impure by the Mosaic revelation. That the brute creation, and even the vegetable, shared with man in the benefits afforded by the action of the sun and of other physical agents, was no proof that they were more than, or equally with man, the final cause of the existence of those agents. As well might it be argued that the dogs were the end for which the ædiles ordered the arrangements of a city, though they could not but have their share of advantage from what was intended for the service of the citizens. Into the question of the origin of evil, Origen does not go very deeply in this treatise, but lays down the principle, that each man's own *ἡγεμονικόν*—that is, the ruling principle, the conscience, the will in each man's mind, and not matter, is the cause of the evil that exists in him, and that the acts resulting therefrom, and nothing else, are evils. The question is worked out in much greater detail in an interesting extract from Origen or his school, given in the "Philocalia," where the writer shows that matter cannot be the source of evil, because evil, strictly speaking, always consists in an *action*, and an action is wholly distinct from matter. In the same extract is some ingenious metaphysical reasoning

showing the inconsistency of referring evil to matter, since matter—that is, the original matter—is destitute of quality, whereas evil comes under the category of quality. This may be sufficient to show the nature of the difficulties with which Christian disputants had to contend, under this head, with those who came to them from the philosophical schools, and of the necessity under which they found themselves of mastering the theories of the sects.

XIII. We now proceed to exemplify more in detail the line of attack which Celsus directed against the great facts of the Christian revelation, partly in the character of the Jewish disputant. Origen was well accustomed to the Jewish field of argument, and finds that his opponent was but indifferently versed in it, as he puts expressions into the mouth of his Jew which were unknown or seldom heard in the Hebrew schools. We find incidentally that the Jews were at that period in a state of what may be called national senility, nothing great or imposing was to be found among them, and conversions from among them were rarer and less satisfactory than those from heathenism. We shall take in order the leading points as follows :—The Incarnation ; Birth of our Lord from a Virgin ; His Baptism ; the History of the Passion ; His Resurrection.

The idea of the Incarnation seems to have suggested to the mind of Celsus very much the same style of objection with which we are so familiar in the polemics of modern Protestantism against Catholicity. He accused the Christians of being carnal-minded, of loving the body, and said they were φιλοσώματων γένος, precisely as Protestants would contend that in believing Transubstantiation we take an earthly, fleshly, corporeal view of what ought to be spiritually understood. Origen scarcely meets this objection in the present treatise on the deep basis which is the only sufficient one—the necessity of the Incarnation for the rehabilitation of fallen human nature. In more than one place he endeavours to evade it by alleging the passage of St. Paul, “If we have known Christ according to the flesh, now we know Him so no longer;” as if it meant that Christ gradually raised us to know Him as He was antecedently to His taking man’s flesh upon Him, and not rather that we know Him as the Saviour of all, not in a mere earthly and human way, as the Jews might have imagined Him the Messiah for their own nation only. He offers as a prominent reason for the suffering and death of our Lord, that there are in the nature of things deep and mysterious causes why great evils are averted by innocent suffering, of which examples are afforded in Greek mythology. This, in substance, has been powerfully worked out by Butler in the

"Analogy," yet in his own manner of appealing to the facts that meet us in the ordinary moral government of the world, where there is so much vicarious and substituted suffering daily going on. Origen truly regards the great Sacrifice as needed to break the power of that fallen Angel whose dominion over mankind had assumed proportions so portentous by the time of our Lord's Incarnation. We might, however, desiderate a more complete and clear exposition from a mind so full of the fire of Divine love as his undoubtedly was, did we not bear in mind that he is reasoning with an infidel and a pagan, and was bound to place himself in the point of view likeliest to recommend his proofs to the pagan intellect.

Very many of Celsus' objections are based on the supposed inconsistency between the facts of the Christian revelation and what God *ought* to have done under the circumstances. Thus, he asks, why need He have been born in the womb of a Virgin and not rather have otherwise moulded a human body around Him, or why did He appear in one corner of the world and not rather appear simultaneously in various quarters of the world? Again, He *ought* to have appeared in form, stature, eloquence, and persuasiveness, such as to have carried all before Him; He *ought* to have been like the sun, displaying His own evidence; He *ought* to have taken summary vengeance on His judges; He *ought* to have made proof of His Deity by suddenly disappearing from the Cross; He *ought* to have appeared to the world generally after His resurrection, and not here and there to a few. A general and, to minds that already accept natural religion, satisfying answer to that class of objections is furnished by the principle which Origen has formulized in his commentary on the Psalms (given in the "*Philocalia*," c. ii., and which is quoted by Butler, containing, indeed, the germ of his whole system):—"A man who has once admitted that these Scriptures come from the Creator of the world, ought to be persuaded that whatever difficulties meet those who investigate into the *rationale* of the creation will also meet them as regards the Scriptures."

Arguments we have already alleged from this treatise show that Origen, without stating the principle in so many words, attributes great weight to what we may call the reflex evidence of Christianity—that is, the support given to its supernatural claims by the stupendous visible results it has effected in the world. Another application of the same principle may be found in his treatment of Celsus' objection to the history of our Blessed Lord's birth, when he contends that the life of Christ alone would show the moral impossibility, to say no more, of His having sprung from a base and infamous source,

as Celsus had blasphemously insinuated. The latter, indeed, Origen touches but slightly, and throws it aside with the disdain and abhorrence it deserved. He rests here also, as elsewhere, on the general and sure ground of the powerful reasons which there must have been to lead the disciples to spend their lives and encounter the dangers they did in preaching the facts of the life of Jesus to the world.

The question of the miraculous manifestations at our Lord's Baptism introduces some interesting remarks. Celsus had demanded what witness was there for it? and Origen replies by commenting, in the first place, on the great difficulty there must often be in establishing any history, however true, as a matter of fact. He instances, curiously to us, considering familiar historical controversies of the present day, the events of the Trojan War, or of the Seven against Thebes. If any one denied that they ever happened, arguing from the impossibilities interwoven in the common story, how could he be answered? And the same also even for the story of the Epigoni, or the Return of the Heraclidæ, where the like impossibilities do not occur.* All this he premises, as inviting the reader not to have unreasoning faith, but as showing the need of candour, of much investigation, and of entering into the mind of the writers. Here we must remark it must be remembered whom he is addressing, either persons hostile to the faith, and with whom it was a great deal, if he could even get them to give so much as a hearing to the claims of Christianity, or else persons whose faith he sought to confirm by acting upon their reason. He proceeds to state another principle, also of very general application throughout the treatise, that the difficulties urged by the objector (who here is supposed to be a Jew) would hold equally as against innumerable miraculous facts in the Old Testament—the visions, for example, of Ezechiel and Isaias. This principle is that of analogy used in another direction: If you accept the Old Testament, you must not be startled at difficulties in the New Testament of precisely the same kind. The Law and the Prophets were full of miracles, like that of the Dove and of the voice from heaven, and the latter was established by the miracles of our Lord Himself and of His disciples, "for without mighty works they never could have moved the hearers of new words and new doctrines to abandon their ancestral traditions, and accept their doctrines in the face of dangers that threatened their lives." As to the heavens being opened at our Lord's Baptism, Origen adopts a view of considerable boldness.

* *Contra Celsum*, i. p. 32.

He holds, not that the visible heaven was opened and its body parted asunder, but that the percipient was affected in a certain way, analogous to the action of the mind in dreams; the same power that shapes its ruling principle to those imaginations, might shape it also, waking, in like manner for the good of him in whom the image is shaped, and of those who shall hear him. "I do not," he says, referring to Ezechiel's vision, "suppose that the visible heaven was opened, and its body parted asunder that Ezechiel might write that: may it not thus be that he who wisely hears the Gospels may admit the like in the case of the Saviour? though this may offend the more simple, who in their great simplicity set the universe in motion, cleaving this vast united body of the whole heaven."* He proceeds in an extremely striking manner, but at greater length than we can quote, to bring the same idea to bear on the action of the other senses, as well as sight and hearing. We say this is a very bold view; we cannot think it a safe one, even at the risk of being included in the number of those whom the great Apologist calls "the more simple." We must, however, remark that it shows the danger of these accommodations to the pride of the human intellect, that in another part of the treatise we find Celsus stating as an objection to the fact of our Lord's Resurrection, this very idea of the possibility of a waking dream, and Origen there meeting it by asserting that it is impossible except in the case of those who are wholly out of their mind or labouring under frenzy or melancholia. Still, a distinction may be drawn, on the principle already given as a favourite one of Origen's. The mode of perception might resemble that of a dream, and yet the fact be real.

Among the various points discussed under the head of the Passion, the whole subject of foreknowledge receives a deep and wise treatment. Celsus had objected to certain prophecies (those concerning Judas Iscariot and St. Peter) as forcing their objects to be impious. Origen replies on the principle Butler has followed—viz., that the foreteller is not the cause of the act, but the act (in future) is the cause of its being foretold.† In replying to another remarkable, however obvious objection—viz., why our Lord did not take summary vengeance on His persecutors?—he follows the argument of analogy. We see every day how Providence spares its blasphemers.‡ But he forcibly points out also, that the real agent in the condemnation of our Lord was not Pilate, but the whole nation of the Jews, and it was obvious how the nation had visibly undergone the anger of

* *Contra Celsum*, i. p. 36.

† *Ibid.*, p. 73.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

Heaven since that crowning guilt, having been scattered abroad like the limbs of the mangled Pentheus, to which Celsus had alluded, in the spirit of a rhetoric that was nursed in Greek mythology.*

Concerning the Resurrection, Celsus is not careful to observe consistency in his objections more than in any other parts of his hostile array, now urging that the appearances were simply spectral, of the dim and shadowy kind spoken of in Plato's "Phædo," the σκιοειδῆ φαντάσματα supposed to haunt sepulchres, and then that St. Mary Magdalene was mad, or that other witnesses were in a waking dream, which has been already noticed. As to St. Mary Magdalene, no sort of proof was alleged, and the whole history of St. Thomas was answer enough as to spectral appearances. He had imagined he might be beholding only a spirit-form resembling his Lord (and here Origen quotes from one of the most exquisitely tender passages in Homer)†:—

ἦλθε δ' ἐπὶ ψυχῇ . . .
πάντ' αὐτῷ μεγεθός τε καὶ ὄμματα κάλ', εἰκνῖα,
καὶ φωνήν, καὶ τοῖα περὶ χροὶ εἴματα ἔστο.—*Iliad*, xxiii. 65.

Therefore Jesus, calling Thomas (proceeds Origen), said, "Put in thy finger hither, and see My hands, and bring hither thy hand, and put it into My side; and be not faithless, but believing." The paucity of our Lord's appearances after the Resurrection is explained by Origen on a principle which seems to have powerfully influenced his mind; the proportion which seems to have held in the manifestations of our Blessed Lord, to the capacity of the percipients. Thus, three only were permitted to behold His Transfiguration. All saw Him as man; and His appearances after His Resurrection were rare, and but to chosen witnesses.

XIV. What has been said must suffice as specimens of the reasoning on both sides in this famous treatise. It is hardly necessary to say that very much has been passed over, and much that is hardly less interesting than what has been selected for review, almost the whole field of the Old Testament objections, and those especially relating to the prophecies. It remains to offer some remarks on the character of Origen's mind, and his style as a controversialist. That which struck Butler as his great characteristic, his "singular sagacity," ought certainly to stand first, from respect to so deep a thinker.

* *Contra Celsum*, ii. p. 81.

† *Ibid.*, ii. p. 97.

He is highly suggestive, and powerfully, perhaps too powerfully, influences the mind of the student. One can conceive it quite an epoch in the mental history of many, when first this "great planet swims into their ken." He is very remarkable for the respect with which he treats his opponents, rarely, unless under extreme provocation, permitting himself to use any expression of anger or disdain; and this calmness of language he distinctly lays down as a principle, even in speaking of the objects of pagan idolatry. He is generally a fair reasoner, and does his utmost to meet his adversary's difficulties. On the other hand, he occasionally forgets that an argument may be capable of being retorted. One instance of this we have noticed, and a striking example of the same is the reiterated advantage he takes of an admission made by Celsus about the gods delighting in the odour of the sacrifices. He repeats this no less than nine times in the course of a few pages, though the opponent might have defended himself by the parallel of the sacrifices of the old Law—easily answered, it is true, by any mind capable of these discussions, but still too obvious to the ordinary hearer to have been wisely pressed in that way. Perhaps it is only another phase of the same constitution of mind, that he is singularly apt to introduce an idea, and then immediately dismiss it, as either not adapted to his present purpose, or treated of elsewhere in his writings. Very numerous examples might be given of this. He is remarkable for amplitude of mind, extent of range, and luminous beauty of thought, but is deficient in order and the power of marshalling his argument. It is true that in this treatise he follows the order of his antagonist, such as it was; still, Origen himself admits that he had changed his plan as he went on. The first book seems to have been his original conception, which was on a much smaller scale than the form which his idea took as he warmed with his subject, and consequently there is a good deal of repetition. It is so far convenient, however, that the first book furnishes an excellent *résumé* by anticipation of his general treatment of the subject. His experience as a catechist in the Alexandrine school makes his work highly practical and valuable; here and there, too, are interesting notices from his personal observation, as of the cave at Bethlehem and the cisterns of Ascalon. No book requires to be read with greater caution as to conclusions to be drawn from its silence. Many things are omitted altogether, and some barely mentioned which belonged to the very life of the Church; we may notice, as instances of the latter, his allusion to the Eucharistic banquet, and to the observance of the Christian festivals. The

vexed question of Origen's orthodoxy we have only met upon general grounds; it has been exhaustively discussed in an important treatise to which the attention of our readers was directed in an article on Origen, which appeared about twelve years ago in this REVIEW.*

ROBERT ORNSBY, M.A.

ART. IV.—ON THE ORIGIN OF THE "SOLAR MYTH,"
AND ITS BEARING ON THE HISTORY OF
ANCIENT THOUGHT.†

THE Article in the January REVIEW, on "Pre-Homeric Legends of the Voyage of the Argonauts," brought to the author of it an interesting and instructive correspondence. Several scholars, well known in the literary world, readily expressed their opinions that the "Odyssey," as we now have it, may have been more largely indebted to the "Argonautica" than has hitherto been acknowledged, or even suspected. "Your inference" (says a distinguished writer) "that the 'Argonautica' and the 'Odyssey' are both drawn independently from the old storehouse of myths, seems to me irresistible." Indeed, a clear allusion to the story of Jason, and his touching at the island of Lemnos, occurs also in a passage of the "Iliad" (vii. 469), to which a reference ought to have been given. But, while assent was in most cases accorded to this part of the argument, dissent was expressed by several writers and critics, whose opinion on the subject is certainly entitled to consideration, from the "solar" interpretation suggested of the "golden fleece." I quote here

* Professor Vincenzi's work, of which the title is: "In S. Gregorii Nysseni et Origenis scripta et doctrinam nova recensio," per Aloysium Vincenzi. 4 voll. Romae, 1865." The article referred to is one of a series which appeared in the DUBLIN REVIEW in the course of the year 1866. See particularly that in the October number of that year, "Origen at Cæsarea." We regret that these articles only came into our hands when just concluding the present paper.

† In presenting to the readers of this REVIEW a brief sketch of a subject in itself curious, if somewhat speculative, the writer desires to say that he has purposely avoided opening a great question, how far these myths may be corruptions of a primitive Revelation given to man when first placed as a reasoning being on the earth. The argument here pursued turns solely on the probability, or possibility, that sensuous conceptions of the phenomena of Nature gave rise to opinions and expressions, which in the course of long ages developed themselves into a system of mythology.

the words of one well-known writer on Ancient Art:—"I can see no connection between sun-worship and the solar myth. Sun-worship is natural and obvious. The sun is daily before our eyes, bestowing light and heat, contributing to the growth of animal and vegetable life; he is the chief animating principle in Nature. But straining and twisting a plain story of human life into the counterpart of the sun's daily course in the heavens is unobvious and unnatural. What do we gain by being told that in the 'Iliad,' which is a representation of human life and character amidst struggles and difficulties—that Achilles and Agamemnon are sunbeams and shadows—that the rival hosts of Greeks and Trojans are mists and breezes, pursuing each other over an imaginary plain? What would you think, if it was said that 'Waverley,' which is another representation of human life and character, typifies the passage of the sun through clouds and mists, with occasional bursts of sunlight? This symbolical mode of treating the myth is totally inconsistent with the phase of mind of that early age; and this is, in my opinion, an insuperable difficulty. Symbolism argues a late phase of mind, and a late age." Another correspondent "thinks the argument is not very strong that the 'fleece' was the sun; and if it *was* the sun the adventurers went to explore, what (he asks) is the meaning of *finding* the fleece? Was it some great discovery in astronomy?" A fourth, approving and accepting the article as a whole, reminds me that in treating of Colchis and the sun-lands of the East, in connection with Jason, I should have referred to Herodotus (iv. 179 and vii. 193) as containing the same legends which are given by Pindar in the fourth Pythian Ode. A fifth correspondent also accepts the solar theory, and believes that the well-known story of Little Red Riding-Hood has no other origin. Thus opinions are divided; but there seems a decided preponderance, in all the letters received, against the "solar-myth theory."

And yet the full discussion and exposition of the theory in Sir G. W. Cox's "Mythology of the Aryan Nations,"* including as it does (book ii. chap. iii.) the legend of the Golden Fleece, might have satisfied some of the objectors that no other view presents any reasonable explanation of this and similar stories.

I think the subject so very important in itself (since it is so closely allied to the earliest developments of human thought and religion), that, though it may be uninviting to some from its very novelty to them, I propose in the present Paper to return to it. Assuredly, it deserves the special attention of all who are interested in the advancement of learning and the

* In two vols. 8vo, C. Kegan Paul, 1878.

single pursuit of Truth. For, if it can be shown (for instance) that Thucydides was wrong in attributing an historical reality to Agamemnon and Theseus, and to the ten-years' war at Troy, our whole conceptions of early traditional history may demand a serious reconsideration.

Since the publication of the article in question, a distinguished scholar and Orientalist, Professor Sayce of Oxford, has been delivering a lecture at Bath* on this very subject. He is a disciple of Professor Max Müller, and with him he holds that there was a certain period in man's history, at which he had not attained to our modes of representing thought and abstract ideas, but interpreted all the impressions received by the senses as manifestations or agencies proceeding from elemental beings having personality, and therefore even sex. "Myths originate," says Professor Sayce, "in the inability of language fully to represent our thoughts, in changes of signification undergone by words as they pass through successive generations, and in the consequent misinterpretation of their meaning."

In a long and learned Paper by Professor Max Müller on "Comparative Mythology," in vol. ii. of "Chips from a German Workshop," the author takes the same view. Day and night, summer and winter, storm and thunder, he observes, are with us virtually abstract notions; yet we continue to speak of them as agents, and attribute to them, quite illogically, real action, as when we say "the day dawns," "the night approaches." Now as, in ancient language, all such words had terminations expressive of gender, it followed that each term assumed unconsciously a sexual and individual character. And what, he asks, must have been the result of this? "As long as people thought in language, it was simply impossible to speak of morning or evening, of spring and winter, without giving to these conceptions something of an individual, active, sexual, and, at last, personal character. They were either nothings, as they are nothings to our withered thought, or they were something; and then they could not be conceived as mere powers, but as beings powerful" (p. 55).

Myths, then, says Professor Sayce, "originated in the misinterpreted explanations of physical and mental phenomena furnished by primitive man." He had to explain the constitution of the world, and he personified Nature. The epithets and phrases he used were handed down to higher races, who had lost the key to their interpretation. As oral traditions, such stories were taken for what they seemed to mean; and as any such literal interpretations appeared absurd or impossible, they

* January 29, 1879.

were in time regarded as fables or inventions, and not what in their origin they really were, *imperfect descriptions of facts*. They are "the fairy-tales of the childhood of the human race;" the fictions of a simple credulity, and the expressions of perceptions purely objective, sensuous, and devoid of generalization.

The difficulty which the human mind experiences in speaking of general, collective, and abstract ideas, goes far to explain many obscurities in the subject of mythology. "If," asks Professor Müller,* "we ourselves in speaking of the sun or the storms, sleep or death, either connect no distinct idea at all with these names, or allow them to cast over our mind the fleeting shadows of the poetry of old, and invoke them as if they could hear us,—why should we wonder at the Ancients, with their language throbbing with life and revelling in colour, if, instead of the grey outlines of our modern thought, they threw out those living forms of Nature, endowed with human powers, nay, with powers more than human, inasmuch as the light of the sun was brighter than the light of a human eye, and the roaring of the storms louder than the shouts of the human voice?"†

In the age which gave birth to these myths, adds the Professor, "words were heavy and unwieldy. They said more than they ought to say, and hence much of the strangeness of the mythological language, which we can only understand by watching the natural growth of speech. Where we speak of the sun following the dawn, the ancient poets could only speak and think of the sun loving and embracing the dawn. What is with us a sunset, was to them the sun growing old, decaying, or dying. Our sunrise was to them the night giving birth to a brilliant child; and in the spring they really saw the sun or the sky embracing the earth with a warm embrace, and showering treasures into the lap of Nature."‡

A *myth*, properly so called, is altogether different from an *allegory*. In the latter, there is the conscious intention of representing actions and agents under the guise of a story which conceals their reality. But it is the essential character of a true myth that it should no longer be intelligible by a reference to the spoken language.§ A myth is a primitive expression of phenomena not scientifically understood, and by the necessities of language invested with a personal character. That personal

* "Comparative Mythology," p. 59.

† The same tendency to personify objects and to give them *sex* is shown in our calling a ship or a locomotive engine "she;" indeed, "he" and "she" are still commonly applied to the sun and the moon. Curiously enough, the Saxon *Móna* is masculine, and *Sunne* feminine.

‡ "Comparative Mythology," p. 65.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 70.

character remained unchanged long after the ideas represented by it had undergone great developments in the human intelligence. The sun darting his rays was Apollo shooting his arrows; the sun setting in glory behind a hill was Hercules being burnt on a funeral pile on a mountain-top. In Homer and Hesiod, who, according to a strange expression of Herodotus,* "made the theogony for the Greeks," we have myths in their full-grown and even decaying state; Achilles and Odysseus, sun-gods in their origin, are merely half-human warriors. It is in the early Indian literature, the hymns of the Veda, that we find the growth of the myth.† As an example of a description of a common phenomenon passing into a tale about living agents, the author cites Endymion, who was said to have been visited by the moon on the Latmian hill, and to have slept an eternal sleep that he might always receive her nightly caresses. He shows that Endymion is from *δύω*, and means the setting sun; that the moon rising when the sun was setting was expressed in the language of myth by Selene watching Endymion; that in later ages the story was interpreted of the son of a king of Elis who was loved by a young princess. Here is a case, as all will acknowledge, where a very simple account has been developed into a history of real persons. Many curious and fantastical expansions of the same story in later ages are given at length in pp. 78-81 of the Essay we have cited. In this way the author explains as solar myths the fables in the Greek poets about Cephalos and Eos (Aurora), Cephalos and Procris (the sun and the dew), Apollo and Daphne. This word Daphne, meaning also a bay-tree, gave rise to the story of the nymph being changed into a tree. But the word really was the Sanscrit *ahan* (dahan, Ahanâ), the Greek *Athena*, and the English *dawn*.‡ Another form is *Danae*, the mythical mother of the solar hero Perseus. Now we see why (as explained in my former Paper) the "ægis" of the goddess Pallas Athena is nothing but a bright sun-cloud—the glowing garment of the morning.

4 Sir George Cox, in his very learned and interesting work on "The Mythology of the Aryan Nations," has pursued this subject still further. He has, indeed, analysed and brought under the same general rule all the myths and fables of antiquity, so many of which, in a slightly altered form, survive to the present day as familiar nursery tales. He points out, as Professor Max

* Lib. ii. 53.

† "Comparative Mythology," p. 76. "The Veda is the real theogony of the Aryan races, while that of Hesiod is a distorted caricature of the original image."

‡ Ibid., pp. 90-93. The name *Danae* may mean *sea*, or *water* (Danube, Don, &c.).

Müller had done, that there was an age of mythology—a period in man's history when it was the inevitable result of his imperfect attempt to express and describe the operations of Nature. "On the hypothesis of a form of thought which attributed conscious life to all physical objects, we must at once admit that the growth of a vast number of cognate legends was inevitable."* The numerous aspects assumed by the sun gave birth to as many *μῦθοι*, ways of speaking about him, which afterwards passed into legends, and became the only history which survived from those remote ages. As there was no limit to his varying aspects, so there was no limit to the varieties of description. The idea of *existence* expanded into that of *personality*. Living things became living persons; and living persons, associated with stupendous and apparently miraculous powers, were exalted into gods. Gods, in their turn, must have a locality, with various adventures and relations, actions and sufferings, passions and emotions. With deification came worship and rites of propitiation. And thus in time mythology, if not the origin of unrevealed religion, became intimately associated with it. Early Christianity, which could see in pagan mythology nothing but the worship of devils, perhaps failed to perceive, as clearly as we now do, that all religions have a great deal in common. Reverence and awe, prayer and a desire to please with a fear of displeasing, self-devotion and faith in Divine goodness and justice, are as possible with the sun-worshipper as with a believer in the true God. But the impurity and grossness attaching to the later developments of the myths not unnaturally excited the indignation of the Christian missionaries, as it had given rise first to the doubts and then to the protests of Euripides and Plato.

The development of solar myths, then, so far from being an absurdity, was a necessity of man's existence, when he could only use such language as described everything under personal attributes. It is only because the moon and the stars are obviously secondary powers in the sky that the principal source of myth was the sun. The objection, so often alleged, that "your system makes everything to be the sun," finds its answer in this consideration. The corruption of myths, solar or of any other character, and their transition into endless absurdities and indecencies, is nothing more than was to be expected. For all that, *in their origin they were not pure creations of fancy*—mere fabrications of ingenious idleness. They came into being because they had a meaning; they passed into absurdity or obscenity only because that meaning was wholly forgotten and

* Vol. i. p. 110.

unknown. It is mainly through the knowledge of Indian literature that the interpretation of these stories has become possible. "Comparative mythology," like comparative language, has become a science; and as both are new sciences, resulting from our extended knowledge of mankind and the records and monuments of his history, so we cannot wonder at, much less ought we to blame, the zeal of those who, not having this knowledge, denounced, as coming from the Father of Lies, the system which they found in its latest and most corrupt developments, and which they gave their whole energies to expose and to destroy.

One of the proofs that most of the Greek legends about the gods and heroes—Heracles, Apollo, Perseus, Theseus, Œdipus, Odysseus, &c.—are of solar origin, consists in the fact, so well pointed out by Sir George Cox,* that *essentially the same actions are attributed to them all*. They are all slayers of monsters, or powerful foes; all court or carry off or return to a bride; all grow up brave, all perform some wonderful feat; all go in quest of some lost treasure; generally, they are exposed in infancy, but survive to cause the death of their own parents (like Perseus, Œdipus, and Paris); they perform set tasks or labours; they are faithless to their first loves; they are reunited to them in the end. The simple fact, as it appears to the sense, that the sun leaves the East and yet is found there again on the very next day, was spoken of under the figure of a bridegroom torn from his bride, soon to be reunited. It is thus that Paris is separated from Helen and Oenone, Achilles from Briseis, Ulysses from Penelope. Thus, "we can see at once that Athenians, Thebans, Argives, Spartans, regarded as independent and local narrative tales which are merely modified versions of the same story. Their convictions furnish not even the faintest presumption that the actors in the great dynastic legends ever had any historical existence, or that the myths themselves point to any historical facts."†

Events and persons that seem to be historical, and have been, and even still are, commonly accepted as such, like Theseus, Achilles, and Agamemnon and the Trojan War, for the most part involve this grand difficulty, that *nearly the same accounts occur in the legends of other nations*. "If," says Sir G. Cox,‡ "all these tales have some historical foundation, they must relate to events which took place before the dispersion of the Aryan tribes from their original home. If the war at Troy took place at all, as the Homeric poets have narrated it, it is, to say

* "Aryan Mythology," book i. chap. v. p. 80. † Ibid., vol. i. p. 83.

‡ Ibid., vol. i. p. 156. Even King Arthur and his Round Table is doubtless a solar story. Compare the "golden table" in the temple of Belus in Babylon, Herod. i. 179.

the least, strange that precisely the same struggle, for precisely the same reasons, and with the same results, should have been waged in Norway and Germany, in Wales and Persia."

But, though the epic poet himself believed he was describing real heroes and their deeds, it is impossible not to acknowledge that the son of the sea-goddess and his early death, Ulysses and his long wandering in the West far from his expectant and disconsolate Penelope, must have been, in their remote origin, in lands far away from Greece or Asia Minor, *solar legends*. For almost every detail, when impartially examined, suits the changing phases of the sun, and nothing but that.* Yet we not only read repeated asseverations that the Trojan war contains at least a nucleus of true history, but we are assured that Priam's palace and Agamemnon's skeleton have been disinterred by a living explorer, who himself avows his belief in them as such.

If we only compare the story of Penelope being regarded as a still young and loving bride after her husband's absence for twenty years, with the legend of *Edipus* having children by his own mother *Jocasta*, we shall see that these tales must belong to "that class of mythical beings whose beauty time cannot touch" (*"Aryan Mythology,"* i. p. 222). Again, nearly the same adventures are attributed to *Hercules* and to *Theseus*. In the play of *Euripides*, "*The Mad Hercules*," these two men of valour are represented as close friends. This is the blending of two national solar heroes into one narrative. *Perseus*, "the destroyer," was another solar hero; his adventures do but reproduce, with variations, the same main and leading idea.

Sir George Cox confidently asserts "the absolute identity of the great mass of Hindoo, Greek, Norse, and German legends."† This one fact, if a fact it be, shows that they cannot be history; the other fact, their mythological significance and consistency, shows that neither are they idle tales and mere inventions, but *expressions of conceptions*. Again, if this is so, and they are all the product of an era in the age of mankind, that era must be a remotely ancient one, because the same tales were carried far and wide by races on their dispersion from a common centre in the East. The hypothesis of conscious borrowing is untenable, not only because it is itself unlikely (for if such tales are

* I say this with some confidence, having for years gone thoroughly into the question. What is known as "Euemerism," or the attempt to extract some truth out of legend, was a theory to which I formerly inclined; but I accept the just rebuke of Sir G. W. Cox for doing so (*"Aryan Mythology,"* vol. i. p. 173), in a Paper contributed long ago to the *Home and Foreign Review*. I am aware, of course, that the bare statement above reads like a begging of the entire question.

† Vol. i. p. 164.

mere inventions, each nation would invent for itself), but because "it would lead us to infer an amount of intercourse between the separated Aryan tribes for which we shall vainly seek any actual evidence."* Moreover, the ideas pervading these stories are not merely similar; they are substantially identical in all their essential details and characteristics. All of them "may be placed together in one class, as springing from phrases which at first denoted physical phenomena."† They all turn upon movements between the East and the West for the recovery of some stolen treasure, or rightful inheritance; and this prize or this heritage is the bright land where the sun sinks to rest after his journey through the heaven, or the light of day carried off by the powers of darkness, and brought back again, after a hard battle, in the morning.‡

In reference to the Argonautic legend to which the former article was specially devoted, Sir George Cox entirely agrees as to its strictly solar character. I am glad to add his high authority in confirmation of my own independent researches and conclusions. "The whole mythical history of Hellas," he observes,§ "exhibits an alternation of movements from the West to the East, and from the East back to the West again, as regular as the swayings of a pendulum. In each case either something bright is taken away, and the heroes who have been robbed return with the prize which, after a long struggle, they have regained; or the heroes themselves are driven from their home eastward, and thence return to claim their rightful heritage. The first loss is that of the Golden Fleece; and the chieftains led by Jason set forth in the speaking ship on their perilous voyage to the shores of Colchis. Before the fleece can be regained there are fearful tasks to be done; but the aid of the wise Medea enables Jason to tame the fire-breathing bulls, and to turn against each other the children of the dragon's teeth. Then follows the journey homeward, in which Medea again saves them from the vengeance of Aeetes, and Jason reigns gloriously in Iolchos after his long wanderings are ended. This tale is repeated again in the story of the wrongs and woes of Helen. She, too, is stolen, like the Golden Fleece, from the western land, and carried far away towards the gates of the morning, and a second time the Achaian heroes are gathered together to avenge the disgrace, and to bring back the peerless queen whom they have lost." All these and other similar stories, the author adds, are the favourite theme of the Vedic poets. The whole *Achilleis* is a magnificent solar Epic, telling

* "Aryan Mythology," vol. i. p. 167.

† Ibid., vol. i. p. 217.

‡ Ibid.

§ Ibid., vol. i. p. 204.

us of a sun rising in radiant majesty, soon hidden by the clouds, yet abiding his time of vengeance, when from the dark veil he breaks forth at last in more than his early strength, scattering the mists and kindling the ragged clouds which form his funeral pyre.*

In the childhood of mankind, the daily death of the sun was regarded as a reality. If he was born again, it was not from any astronomical necessity, so to say, but from the sufferance of nature, or of Varuna (*ὐρανός*), the Sky-god, or Dyaus (*Ζεύς*), or from his own benevolence to men, either of which might fail, and the casual eclipses and obscurations might become perpetual. The birth and death of the sun, his connection with the dawn, and his tremendous and victorious efforts to regain it, were the one theme and topic of regard. He was talked about (though in a different sort of language), just as we are always talking, and are never tired of talking, of "the weather." Hence it is that solar myths seem all in all. How natural this was, I hope to show by a few very striking examples.

And first let us examine briefly the stories about Tantalus and Sisyphus. Clearly, if these two persons do not represent the sun-god, the deeds and sufferings attributed to them have no intelligible point or meaning: the origin of such wild fables is quite incapable of explanation. On the other hand, if they do, every detail in the narrative becomes simple and significant. And if it can be shown, even by a single example, that the sun must be meant, then the doctrine of the solar myth is established, and we are compelled to admit that at one period of man's history such anthropomorphic ideas about the sun must have been prevalent, unconsciously perhaps, yet still embodying with a singular consistency facts and phenomena that found this particular mode of expression. In the eleventh book of the "Odyssey" (582-600) there is a short but well-known account of the punishment which Tantalus and Sisyphus had to undergo for their crimes in the other world. Tantalus stood up to his chin in the water of a lake, always making efforts to drink; but whenever he stooped his head, the water retired before him, and the dark earth appeared under his feet. Ripe juicy fruits were shed upon him by trees that grew around—apples, pears, pomegranates, and figs—but no sooner did he stretch his hand to grasp them than they were blown away by the wind.† Can any one seriously doubt that Tantalus immersed in the lake means the sun settling down into the western sea?

* "Aryan Mythology," vol. i. p. 253.

† Hence, of course, our word "to tantalise."

Mento summam aquam attingens siti enecatus Tantalus, was the description of him by an old Roman poet, probably Ennius.* The ancients speculated on the hissing and steaming caused by the red-hot orb being cooled down and extinguished in the sea.

Audiet Herculeo stridentem gurgite solem, says Juvenal.† Fire and water could not co-exist; but in this myth the sun has the mastery, and it is the water that retires before the fire. Hence Homer says it was dried up by the god to punish Tantalus, *καταζήνασκε δὲ δαίμων*.‡

But another story, and at first sight quite a different one, was told about Tantalus. This is given in the prologue of the "Orestes" of Euripides§ and by Pindar. As a punishment for having revealed certain divine mysteries which he had heard when invited by the gods to a celestial banquet, he was suspended in mid-air, with a huge stone hanging ever ready to fall on his head. The name *Tantalus*, like *Atlas* and *Atalante*, is derived from a root *ταλ*, meaning *endurance*. The first syllable is changed from *ταλ* to *ταν*, by a well-known law of language. The word is virtually the same as *τάλαντον*, the beam of a scale, so named from its poisoning and lifting weights. Thus Tantalus means "the Poiser,"—the suspender in air of the great round orb of the sun. It was a primitive idea to represent the sun and the earth as tied together by a chain. Thus Homer|| makes Zeus tauntingly invite the gods to try and pull him out of the sky by hanging with all their weight on to a long golden chain let down to the ground. And he adds, that if the same chain were fastened to Mount Olympus he would pull the whole earth along with it up into the sky. Euripides¶ makes his Electra in a monody utter the following aspiration:—"O that I could fly to that mass of rock that hangs suspended by golden chains midway between earth and sky, even the lump of earthy matter** that is borne along in eddying circles from Olympus." He may mean, by the concluding words, "in the sky," or he may refer to the apparent motion of the sun southwards after rising over the great north-eastern mountain called Olympus from the waters of the Ægean Sea. The Ionic philosopher, Anaxagoras, had asserted that the sun was not a divinity, but only a mass of luminous matter—a ball of glowing metal, *μύδρος*—and he was banished for maintaining so impious a doctrine. Of the meaning, then, of the "hanging rock" in connection with the story of Tantalus, not the slightest doubt can reasonably be entertained. And if this view is the

* Cic. Tusc. Disp., i. ch. 5, § 10.

† Sat. xiv. 280.

‡ Od. xi. 587.

§ v. 5–10.

Pind. Ol. i. 57.

|| Il. viii. 19.

¶ Orest. 982.

** Lit. "the clod," *βῶλον*.

only true one, it follows that the story itself is a "solar myth." But there are other points which bring out and confirm this view still more strongly.

Tantalus, it was fabled, had enjoyed the signal honour of dining with Zeus and the other gods at a celestial banquet.* What is this, but the sun ascending from sea and earth into the upper regions of the sky? It was further fabled that he had served up to them in a "return dinner," given to them at Sipylus,† the limbs of his own son, Pelops; that one of them, Demeter or Ceres, deceived by the cunning cookery, had tasted a portion, and that poor Pelops, when restored to life by Zeus, was *minus* a shoulder. This trifling defect, however, was remedied by an artificial shoulder of ivory being substituted.

This strange and wild (or as Pindar, writing some five centuries before the Christian era, thought it, this profane) tale is explained by modern investigators to signify that the sun scorches up and as it were *cooks* the fruits and the crops produced by his warmth.‡ It may possibly refer to the apparent diminution or dismemberment of the sun himself in eclipse. Many years ago I explained this legend by suggesting that Pelops, which means "swarthy-faced," was perhaps the name of some sun-burnt wanderer from the north or north-east, who when his mantle was removed displayed a white skin underneath.§ But I think it much more probable that, like κύκλωψ "round-faced," πέλοψ, "swarthy-faced," is only an epithet of the sun obscured by clouds or mists.

But what about the banquet? it will be asked. Nothing can be more obvious.

To the Greek, the visit of a stranger meant the obligation of offering hospitality; and hospitality offered meant hospitality returned. Therefore, if Tantalus (the sun) went from earth to heaven, and back again to earth, when he appeared over Mount Sipylus, he received and gave a feast, the one in heaven the other on the earth. Thus, in the opening of the "Odyssey,"|| the poet says that Poseidon had gone to the distant Æthiopians to partake of a sacrifice and a feast; and the same is said of Zeus and the other gods in the First Book of the "Iliad" (423).

Tantalus thus offers up his own son, as Agamemnon offered up his own daughter Iphigenia, as Atreus served up to his

* Eur. Orest. 8. Pind. Ol. i. 60.

† A mountain on the west coast of Asia Minor. Pindar describes the ἀμοιβαία δειπνα, rejecting the cannibal aspect of it as impious and absurd, Ol. i., *ibid*.

‡ The Roman poets frequently use *coquere* and *coctus* in this sense.

§ Dr. Donaldson adopted this explanation as "undoubtedly true" in "Varronianus," p. 448, ed. 2.

|| i. 22-25.

brother Thyestes the flesh of his own children,* and as Astyages did the same to Harpagus† who had offended him, and as Medea killed her children to vex their faithless father Jason. There must be some connection in these stories; probably they are all in their origin solar, and differ in nothing but the mode of expression from the story told in Hesiod of Kronos (Saturn) devouring his own offspring.‡ All things that are produced from the earth are consumed by it; that which is the womb is also the grave; a sentiment expressed over and over again by poets, ancient and modern.

Primitive men, like the low races of to-day, lived in constant fear of sorcery. They believed in witches and "wise men" who could draw the moon from the sky, and hide the sun in perpetual night. More than this, they feared that the sun might some day fall, and set the whole world on fire. This belief, that the end of all things would be a general conflagration, was very commonly held.§ It was partly suggested by the fall of meteors, partly by volcanic outbreaks, which made them fear both fire without and fire within. Some day, Tantalus himself might be hurled from the sky, torch in hand, and set the world ablaze for the sins of man! There is a remarkable passage in Sophocles,|| to which, indeed, this view gives an entirely new, and evidently the only correct, interpretation. Speaking of the Argive chief Capaneus, who was struck by a thunderbolt and hurled from the rampart just as he was about to fire the city, the poet says that "he fell on the rebounding earth with his torch in his hand, *taking the part of a Tantalus*."¶ This is tantamount to comparing his fall with that of the sun itself.

I hope I have shown that Tantalus really is a very interesting person, and that a good deal may be learnt from a right interpretation of the story. But I must dismiss him for the present, and pass on to two of his compeers in the penal under-world, Sisyphus and Ixion. We are told** that Sisyphus was seen by Ulysses in Hades pushing a huge stone up a hill, and labouring and straining with hands and feet to reach the summit. But just as the hill-top was attained, some unknown almighty power†† thrust it back, and "down to the level again bounded

* Æsch. Ag. 1590.

† Herod. i. 118-9.

‡ Hes. Theog. 467.

§ It is mentioned, for instance, both by Cicero and Lucretius.

|| Antig. 134.

¶ ἄντιτύπα δ' ἐπὶ γῇ πέσε τανταλωθεῖς. The participle is usually explained "he fell with a swing," or "making a sumerset." But τανταλωθεῖς is formed like στρατοῦσθαι, ταξιούσθαι, to take one's place in an army or regiment, and to be engaged or occupied in it.

** Hom. Od. xi. 593.

†† κραταῖς, *valida vis*, xi. 597.

the remorseless stone." The verses, describing first the effort of pushing and then the rapid descent, are so constructed as to imitate by their rhythm the action itself—

Striving hard to thrust, he shoved with hands and feet, but
Down to the level again rebounded the runaway rock.

This kind of verse, composed of heavy spondees, is imitated by an old poet, quoted by Cicero—*

Sisyphu' versat

Saxum sudans nitendo neque proficit hilum.

Of this Sisyphus, as of Tantalus, another tale is told. He had returned alive from Hades, by giving the slip, like a runaway slave, to Proserpine and the keepers of the infernal prison. This is alluded to in Sophocles,† as by several other writers whom I need not quote. He was said to have been the real father of Ulysses (himself a solar hero), Laertes‡ being only his putative sire. The cause of his punishment, like that of Tantalus, was, according to one account, the crime of having revealed certain mysteries of the gods; according to another, his refusal to return to the world of spirits. How well all these accounts accord with the "solar myth" must be evident to all. The stone which he is ever rolling up-hill represents the apparent course of the sun from the horizon to the zenith and back again. His descent into, and stealthy return from, the under-world is a feat that the sun, and the sun only, could perform. Lucretius,§ taking the story as he found it, gave it an allegorical meaning which it was never intended to have, and interpreted it of the vanity of the pursuit of wealth and honours which ever slip away:—

Hoc est adverso nixantem trudere montem,
Saxum quod tamen a summo jam vortice rursum
Volvitur et plani raptim petit aequora campi.

Another solar myth is the story of Ixion, who was tortured in Hades by being bound to an ever-revolving wheel. The name *Ixion* probably means "comer" or "visitor," a very appropriate term for the sun-god.|| Similar names are *Hyperion*¶

* Tusc. Disp. i. ch. v. § 10.

† Philoct. 625. He was said to have been left unburied on earth by his own request, and to have obtained permission to return on pretence of punishing his wife for the neglect of his obsequies.

‡ A name resembling *Laius*, the father of *Œdipus*, another "sun-god" in human guise. On the supposed etymology of the word, see Appendix A in "*Aryan Mythology*," ii. p. 367. § iii. 1012.

¶ From *ikvêioθai*, *ἵσταμαι*, though others say the word is Sanscrit.

¶ *ἵπῆρ* and *ἱέναι*, or, perhaps, *ἵπῆρ*, with the termination of a noun. When the word, expressing an attribute, became a person, the patronymic *Ἵππευίδης* was introduced.

Endymion, and *Οὐρανίωνες* as an epithet of the gods. But in the course of time a fable was invented to suit the name, as if from *ἰκέτης*, "a suppliant," that Ixion had come to beg of Jupiter expiation from the guilt of a murder, and being honoured with an interview with the supreme god had become enamoured of the goddess Hera. He is called by ancient poets "the first suppliant."* Jupiter, the story says, so far encouraged or allowed his addresses to Hera (a mythical way of expressing the sun wooing the air) that he gave him for a wife a wraith or phantom (*εἰδωλον*) made of a cloud, from which a Centaur was born as offspring,† but as a punishment for his presumption he was fastened to a four-spoked wheel in the lower world. "I have heard," says the chorus in the "Philoctetes" of Sophocles,‡ "in story, though I have never seen it, that the impious intruders on the bed of Zeus were put on the revolving wheel by the almighty son of Cronus." Pindar gives the narrative as an allegory,§ or moral lesson, to illustrate the fitting reward of ingratitude. None of these very ancient writers seem in the least conscious what the real origin and meaning was of the stories they are relating. Pindar evidently had no notion that Ixion's wheel was the round sun.|| He says he had to undergo this torture for two sins, both as the perpetrator of the first murder by treacherous means, and also as having aspired to the hand of the goddess Juno.

The apparent union of earth and sky, by the supposed contact of the horizon, gave rise to many natural and not unreasonable beliefs. One curious idea was that the heaven was a great brazen vault dipping into the circling ocean that formed the border of the round flat world, and was prevented from sinking therein by being upheld by the giant Atlas. The gods, it was thought, could descend from the welkin and visit the earth, just as the sun himself was seen to do bodily. Alcinous, the Phæacian king, tells Ulysses that in his happy island the gods have been wont to appear visibly, and take a part with the people in the feasts and sacrifices instituted in their honour. The Phæacians themselves are called *ἀγχιθῆοι*, "near to the gods."¶ The sky, in fact, was a high road—a steep one, no

* Æschylus, *Eumen.* 419, 688.

† Hera (Juno) was herself the air. The monster Centaur, like the rocks thrown at Ulysses by the Cyclops, represents the strange forms which cumuli-clouds assume in the sky, and are often "very like a camel."

‡ v. 676.

§ *Pyth.* ii. 21, *seqq.*

|| "The wheel of Ixion can never rest, any more than the sun can pause in his daily career. The legend is almost transparent throughout" ("Aryan Mythology," i. p. 226).

¶ See *Hom. Od.* v. 35, vii. 201.

doubt, but the gods could do everything—between heaven and earth. There was, it was supposed, some far-off region where the vault of heaven closed in the round world as with a wall. Lighted up by sunrise and sunset, the *flammanitia mœnia mundi** were real barriers, beyond which no mortal could go, and behind which Atlas or the Titans or some mighty elemental beings were supposed to have their residence. So far sailors could go in unexplored seas, but no farther: that barrier of cloud and mist and Cimmerian darkness was the limit set to the enterprise of mortal man.† The appearance on earth of a god (the sun-god especially) for a certain period began to be regarded as an "avatar," or the assuming of a human form for the purpose of dwelling among men. Thus it was fabled that Apollo had tended the flocks and herds‡ of Laomedon, king of Troy, and of Admetus, king of Thessaly, in the capacity of a slave, or herdsman, for hire. Clearly, the visits of the sun to earth are thus described; it is another "solar myth." A similar notion is embodied in the descent of Iris down the rainbow to bring messages from the gods to man. Milton, the most classic of poets, has introduced the idea in his beautiful "Ode to the Nativity"—

But He, her fears to cease,
Sent down the meek-eyed Peace;
She, crown'd with olive green, came softly sliding
Down through the turning sphere,
His ready harbinger,
With turtle wing his amorous clouds dividing;
And waving wide her myrtle wand,
She strikes a universal peace through sea and land.

Few, perhaps, who gaze at the bright hues of the flower so familiar under this name are aware that the word really means "Speaker."§ The rainbow itself was identified with the airy

* Lucretius, i. 67.

† Eurip. Hippol. 745.

‡ "Iliad," xxi. 443; Eur. Alcest. 6–8. Nothing is so common in Aryan mythology as the mention of *cows* or *oxen* in connection with the sun. They seem to represent bright forms that appear to go forth, in the form of luminous fleeting clouds, from the home of the sun in the east. The stealing and recovery, or the killing of these oxen, is the subject of many of the tales in the early Greek legends.

§ Sir G. W. Cox ("Aryan Mythology," i. p. 366) seems to say that the meaning of the name is unknown. The word takes the digamma in Homer—i.e., it was pronounced "Wiris." The root is the same as in *εἶναι* and *ἐπέσθαι*. Thus the beggar *Irus*, in Od. xviii. 6, is said by the poet to have been so called "because he used to go and carry messages whithersoever any one ordered him." An amusing satire on the notion of a messenger-goddess, with a somewhat undignified treatment of the painted lady, may be read in the "Birds" of Aristophanes, v. 1200, *seqq.*

form that was believed to descend and ascend by that heavenly arch. From the red hues that it displayed, it was associated with the idea of wars and blood, as the Aurora Borealis or a comet has often been, even among people who ought to know better.* This involved the notion of truce, and of the intervention of a messenger between the gods and men, to propose and discuss the terms of it.

One of the most favourite and at the same time most natural and appropriate personifications of the sun, was as a far-shooting and never-failing archer. So Apollo, Hercules,† Odysseus; so the moon-goddess and huntress Artemis, Io "the shooter,"‡ were always represented as armed with and skilful in the use of the bow; so the arrows of Hercules, inherited by Philoctetes, were ἀφικτοι, always fatal.§ Sudden deaths by sun-stroke are attributed to the vengeful arrows of the god or the goddess, according to the sex of the person struck by them.

It is very difficult to persuade any one to listen with patience and impartiality to the arguments which tend to show that the "Iliad" and the "Odyssey" are "solar myths." It is thought a kind of sacrilege, by those many persons who prefer sentiment to truth, to "explain away" all the chivalry and the heroism of those great poems, and to divest them of every particle of history. They do not sufficiently see that the Greek poet is but dressing up after his own conception (which undoubtedly was that of real and historical persons) very ancient traditions that he was introducing to his countrymen, in entire ignorance of their origin and true meaning. At the present day, from our extended knowledge of Indian literature, we can interpret this meaning, though "Homer" himself knew it not.

Those who impartially consider the plan of the two great Homeric epics, will find the arguments for their solar origin are extremely strong. Here we have Thetis, the sea, marrying Peleus (πηλὸς meaning, like *tellus*, τέλλος and τέλμα "wet earth"). From the union is born Achilles, who is the sun springing out of the sea. The prayer of Thetis to Zeus, to do honour to her son, on which much of the action of the "Iliad" turns, is the

* See "Iliad," xi. 27.

† The club of Hercules is much later in art than the accoutrement of the bow.

‡ Connected perhaps with *iéuai*. Some scholars hold that this name, in common with ἰόλη, ἰοκάστη, ἰαμος, ἰωνες, refers to the violet-coloured clouds in the purple east; and thus, they observe, Φοῖβος is represented as the guardian and tutor of Achilles.

§ Soph. Phil. 105.

ascent of the sun-god to heaven. The might, the invincible prowess, the unwearied strength of the hero, and his powers of destruction and devastation—nay, even his divinely-made shield—are merely attributes of the sun in his midday splendour. Similarly Ulysses, *Odysseus*, is the setting sun.* He has wandered away far into the western seas, and he is detained there by monsters and sorcerers, while his heart's desire is to get back to his home in the East. He descends alive into the under-world, and he returns from it. He kills the monsters that oppose and delay the repossession of his rights, and he regains his palace and his ever-young bride; it is the sun reunited to Aurora. The Cyclops, whose eye he puts out, is himself the sun vanishing by storm-clouds or eclipses from the sky. The palace of Alcinous, glowing with colours, is the bright sun-set; the ships that sail as automata, and convey Ulysses from Phæacia to Ithaca, are the clouds that escort and accompany the sun in his career (*Od.* viii. 558). All this is really plain, though the author of the poem shows not the slightest consciousness of any such meaning. To him all the heroes are real characters, and all the countries and islands traversed have a real geographical existence. Dr. Schliemann himself has not a firmer belief in the historical character of Priam, whose palace he believes he has found! And yet even Priam was very nearly related to a "sun-god;" for he was brother to old Tithonus, who was fabled to have taken the young Aurora as his bride!†

Penelope's "web," which the suitors found her weaving in the day, while she unravelled it at night, is but the cloud-tissue of dissolving mist.

To many, these and similar explanations appear as farfetched, as to others they appear obvious and natural. We must not hope to make all persons see all things with the same eyes. Objectors say, "You make everything and everybody mean the sun." Is it nothing, that so large a portion of ancient mythology, on this theory alone, admits of one consistent interpretation—one that makes sense out of nonsense, and supplies a motive, of all others the most probable, for the composition of such stories? There was undoubtedly a period in man's history when "everything was the sun," because the sun was everything to everybody. It was the one centre of all his

* Like *Endymion*, the name contains the root of *δύειν* or *δύεσθαι*, "to set."

† The name of Priam's queen, *Hecuba*, *Ἑκάβα*, "the far-goer," is significant. Compare *ἐκατηβόλος* and *Ἑκάτη* as applied to the sun and moon. On the "historical value of Homer" as maintained by Mr. Gladstone and others, see Appendix B, in vol. ii. of "Aryan Mythology."

thoughts, worship, hopes, and aspirations. It was his god, and as a living, moving, and conscious agent, alike powerful for good or for harm, the giver alike of life and death, health and sickness, famine and plenty, fertility and drought, he was the theme of all their varied powers of description. Races there were, which knew of nothing else that governed the world, or which gave light and withdrew it: they venerated the sun while they feared it; they prayed to it, worshipped it, sacrificed to it, and propitiated it. We are entitled to accept reasonings on any subject which are based upon assumptions that will account for all the phenomena. This, in fact, is the ground of all astronomical and geological science. We accept as certain, and even as demonstrated facts, such inferences as entirely fall in with all that we see, and are sufficient to explain it. It is no doubt true that solar myths are incapable of being reduced to the same degree of certitude; nevertheless, the nature of the proof is the same. We conclude that boulders, scattered for hundreds of miles over the country, were conveyed by glaciers, because no known force except ice could deposit them under the same conditions. We conclude that Ixion's wheel and Sisyphus' stone meant the sun, because nothing will account for the invention and acceptance of either story if it was a mere idle figment.

It may be objected, why do most of these tales turn on crimes and their punishment in the other world? Are they not, for that very reason, mere creations of imagination acted on by the instinctive fear of the Unseen? The answer, again, is obvious. The withdrawal of the light of the sun was attributed to the passage of the sun-god under the world. The ideas of Elysium, of light vouchsafed to blessed spirits, and of the darkness of the damned, were inseparable from such physical reasonings. And the notion of offending the sun-god by sins of omission or commission gave rise to superstitious fears, depicting the penalty attaching to them in another state of existence. The descent from a higher to a lower grade of existence is inseparable from the notion of something done to deserve the degradation. The sun detained in the regions below was the sun in a state of servitude and subjection.

A curious but well-known characteristic of solar myths is the identification of the sun both with the agent or patient, and with the thing or object on or by which the act is exercised. Ixion is the sun, and so is Ixion's wheel. Tantalus is the culprit who fears the fall of the rock, and the rock itself. Ulysses is the setting sun, who puts out the eye of day by blinding the Cyclops. Hercules is the sun, who expires in flame on the summit of Mount Ceta; but the fiery robe which scorched him to death

is the sun-cloud.* Now this, so far from being an objection to the theory, goes far to confirm it. It is the unconscious blending of two modes of representation—the sun as a person, and the sun as a thing. To construct a story, there must be both agents and subject-matter for action; and both, from different points of view, may be the same; Tantalus is the same as the rock which hangs over him, and Ixion is neither more nor less than his own wheel.

The numerous legends of adventurous heroes who descended alive into Hades in quest of some lost friend, or, like Hercules, to bring back to earth a denizen of the infernal world, such as the dog Cerberus, can only refer to the sinking of the sun below the horizon, and his return in the East. Here, again, we notice the characteristic just explained; the sun goes in search of himself. Orpheus goes to fetch his wife Eurydice, Theseus to recover his friend Peirithous, Ulysses to consult the ghost of Teiresias (by a process differing in nothing from the revived superstition of "spirit-rapping") about his absent wife; the goddess Ceres to find her daughter Proserpine, who had been carried off as a bride to Pluto. The name *Odysseus* probably contains the root of *δύναι*, "to set;" yet so unconscious was the author of the "Odyssey" of this meaning, that he refers it to *ὀδύσασθαι*, "to be wrathful," on account of the anger of Poseidon against Ulysses for killing the Cyclops.

I have no desire to press any theory too far, or advocate any non-natural interpretation. But there is a remarkable similarity in the stories told about *Œdipus*, Theseus, and Amphiaraus, that points not obscurely to the same solar origin. The mysterious disappearance of these men under the earth—their supposed existence as *δαίμονες* or hero-spirits, and the cult or worship paid to their tombs,† impart a colouring more than human to their fate. The wierd summons to *Œdipus* in the grove of the Dread Goddesses at Colonus‡—the awful voice that was heard to call *Œdipus*—*Œdipus, why tarry we? All too long we have been waiting for you*,—above all, the marriage with Jocasta—the unconscious union with her from whom he had himself been born—the new sun produced from

* I will just remark here, as a curious circumstance, that an expression in the "Trachiniae" of Sophocles (v. 831), which it is difficult otherwise to explain—viz., the calling the fatal garment, smeared with the poisonous blood of the Centaur, *φονία νεφέλα*, "a gory cloud," may indicate some more conscious treatment of the subject in ancient tradition. Red clouds (as above remarked) have often been supposed to portend wars.

† "Audisne hæc, Amphiaræe sub terram abdite?" says an old poet cited by Cicero, Tusc. Disp. ii. ch. 25, § 60.

‡ Soph. *Œd.* Col. 1627.

the old sun; at once parent and child,—these are all legends of the same kind. The old man suddenly vanishes—no one knows how or where. He is at once alive and dead, extinguished and recreated, perishable and eternal; a denizen of the underworld and the upper-world.

There is a well-known legend, the subject of the Homeric Hymn to Hermes, which is generally allowed, I believe, to be "solar." That cunning god, the patron of rogues and thieves of every description—the *Mercurius* of the Romans—is said to have stolen and driven off a herd of cows while yet an infant. To prevent the theft being discovered by the traces of the animals, he fixed bundles of brushwood to their feet, so that none could tell the direction they had taken.* Now these cows are the clouds; the "oxen of the sun" which figure so conspicuously in the "Odyssey." It is a question of interest, whether the Roman legend of the fire-breathing monster and robber Cacus, who stole the oxen of Hercules (the sun-god) on his return from the West, is not in its origin identical.† The story is told by Virgil, Propertius, and Ovid, and a very good and "sensational" story it is. It was said that one of the cows confined in the cave suddenly lowed, and led Hercules to the spot, where he killed the robber and released the herd. The return of the lost sun after a thunderstorm explains the whole story very simply. The fire-breathing Cacus is the lightning, and the voice of the cow is the muttering of the thunder.

To those who have never considered the subject, many, perhaps all, of the above explanations will appear farfetched, if not absurd or even impossible. That is really no argument against them. It is the hackneyed objection so often raised against conclusions that do not fall in with preconceived opinions on literary subjects. The doctrine of solar myths must be studied as a whole, and the probability that such stories are in no cases mere idle inventions, but rather the creed of a very primitive age, will more clearly appear. Nothing is more shallow than the rejection of a theory, in itself, adequate to account for so large and important a part of ancient literature, merely because it seems strange to us. All that the advocates of the theory ask is a fair hearing. They see no reason whatever to reject it simply because "it makes everything to be the sun." That is precisely what it ought to do.

* Hom. Hymn. ad Herm. v. 80.

† I formerly interpreted this of a pre-historic tradition of some volcanic outbreak or *solfatara* in the neighbourhood of Rome. But I now believe it is as hopeless to extract history out of myth, as sunbeams out of cucumbers. See "Aryan Mythology," vol. ii. pp. 337-41, on the story of Cacus—meaning, perhaps, *Caeus*, "the blind or eyeless being."

Sir G. W. Cox has been charged by some with resolving *all* mythology into the solar myth. But his real object, in his work on the Aryan Mythology, was to show that myths grew up out of phrases applied, in the simplicity of primitive description, to elemental phenomena of all kinds, the principal and most prominent and constant of which were, of course, those of the sun. These notions therefore of the living and moving sun-god may truly be said to ramify into almost every legend of antiquity.

The mere charge of monotony—the constant “harping upon one string”—which the opponents of the solar myth allege as an objection is, as Sir George Cox observes,* equally true of the life of man, and in the dull record of birth and death, of pain and toil, prosperity alternating with adversity. Far more strange, he adds, than the preservation of so many varied stories about the sun, would have been the absence of them from an age and a clime when hardly anything else could have been the theme of popular stories.

F. A. PALEY.

ART. V.—BRITTANY AND THE BRETONS.

1. *La Bretagne Contemporaine*. HENRI CHARPENTIER, imprimeur-éditeur. Paris. 1865.
2. *Barzas Breiz, Chants populaires de la Bretagne*. Par H. DE LA VILLEMARQUÉ. Paris: Delloye. 1859.
3. *Telen Arvor — Furnez Breiz*. Par BIRIZEUX. Paris: Alphonse Lemerre, éd. de 1874.

A PROVINCE three centuries behind the rest of the world ; a national life that is a remnant of the Dark Ages ; a peasantry eminently unprogressive, coarse, ignorant, and superstitious, having the one trifling merit of a picturesque and attractive quaintness in costume and customs ; some prosperity, but only in certain parts of the country ; a vast amount of misery hidden away in the towns. Fortunately, there is hope that modern progress may do its work even here. The two eastern departments, lying nearest the civilised nineteenth-century world, are almost entirely changed, and have to a great extent given up their unpractical notions, political as well as religious, ideas as antiquated as the costumes that they swept away to the stage and the studio. Even the three western

* Vol. i. p. 207.

departments are slowly casting off their old-world dulness and superstition, but it will take some time yet for the good heaven to work through such a mass of contented ignorance. This is the world's view of the question, modified, perhaps, by some sympathy with a country whose natural beauties and simple people have supplied enjoyment for its summer tourists.

A province that has kept its old traditions even in this age of novelty, its old Faith in these unfaithful days; a national life through which still shines the true light, brought to those shores in the early centuries by a hardy Christian race with its crowd of exiled saints; a peasantry that, however wanting in the world's wisdom, has at least wisdom enough to brave its ridicule by standing loyal, unambitious, devoted, not to greed of gain but to home and altar. Unfortunately, it is true that in the east the teaching of so-called modern progress has withdrawn the people from the venerable guidance of the Faith of the Ages, and the principles of '89 have sapped the spirit of loyalty; but westward lies the old province itself, far, indeed, from being all that once it was, but still a stronghold of the Faith, the home of a home-loving race, regarded by them not as a province, a part of the greater country, but as being in itself their own *petite patrie*. Here is a second view directly opposite to the first, yet the subject of both is the same—Brittany and the Bretons. It is easy to account for the difference; one looks to the material and prominent, the other values more the hidden and spiritual. At the same time, those who judge by the higher and truer standard do not call Brittany an Arcadia for this world, or an Eden for the next. Its people are not faultless—where is the race that is? But they are nobly struggling to preserve their religion, their language, their nationality, all that is summed up in their own word *Eur feiz, eur iez, eur galon!*—one Faith, one tongue, one heart. To be truly Breton still means to be truly Catholic; and loyalty to the "*petite patrie*" goes hand in hand with fidelity to the Church.

The world may say that fidelity in this case is nothing better than servitude, that it has kept them far behind the times, poor and ignorant. We answer, their Faith may have taught them that, as the Breton Song of the Bride says, "All vain honours pass like the flowers;" it may have taken away the thirst for better fortune in this life, by giving them the strong and living hope of an eternity where the black daily bread of these years, the goat-skin cloak against the cold, the thatched roof, the patient monotony of toil, will be as bygone as a dream. But while it may have acted in some degree as a curb to ambition, sparing them

thereby much restlessness and repining, it is unjust to ascribe to it the fault, wherever we have to regret their want of enterprise in agriculture or trade; nor is their want of enterprise and progress entirely either an evil or a fault. Those who speak of slavery to the religion of the Dark Ages forget that unprejudiced minds know of three causes which go far towards accounting for the unprogressive character of the Bretons. First, there is the bias of the national mind itself; second, the position and character of their country, which, remote and shut in, was until comparatively late years almost forgotten and untrodden; third, their origin and history, alone quite sufficient to account for their being different in every way from their neighbours of the rest of France, keeping jealousy aloof from them, and holding fast their own old customs and traditions. Moreover, the question may well be asked, What would they have become were they not religious? What would the Bretons be to-day had they dwelt thus aloof, but without those instincts of piety, which are now their second nature? Strangers, travelling amongst them in an honest and not a captious, critical spirit, find much to admire, almost to envy, in Catholic Brittany. What they regret lies outside the sphere of religious influence; what they condemn arises not from excess of simple piety, but from forgetfulness or abuse of it. Wherever there may be local superstitions or social defects, the need is of more piety, not of less. It is as unjust to set down all this to religion and the *cures* as to charge the royalist cause and the bands of loyal peasants with the blood-stained excesses of the *chouannerie*.

Artist, student, antiquary, and pleasure-led wanderer, all are fascinated by that old-world land; but grim philosophers and wise men of social science know better, and have stern things to say about superstition, ignorance, and unprogressive poverty. Every true description of the province is a refutation of this triple charge. Here we can only hope to indicate where the answer lies, just as in a rapid sketch a few rough pencil strokes suggest the form and colour, which every finer touch of detail would make more clear, and which a complete and finished picture would fully express.

Emile Souvestre set before him the task of giving such a finished picture, but he had the dust of anti-clericalism in his eyes and on his pencil, and the result was a good deal of exaggeration and false colour. *Les Derniers Bretons* is as misleading in the text as in the title. It is a fine poem in prose, and, dating from more than forty years ago, it is now less than ever a true representation of Brittany; but his carefully collected hoard of curious beliefs, customs, and anecdotes

still illustrates the character of the people. About the time of its publication there had begun in Paris, with Le Gonidec and Brizeux, what may be called the Breton renaissance. The great *savant* and grammarian, when he was fêted on his arrival in the capital in 1834, found there a whole colony of Bretons, who were afterwards to become distinguished in literature, and who now with the true instinct of the race clung jealously together by evening meetings and reunions in a street near Montmartre. Amongst these, and soon high in the favour of Le Gonidec, was the young Auguste Brizeux, the poet of Brittany. During the next twenty years a succession of writers told each his own tale of the old province, but foremost in the work will always stand those two widely-different names, Le Gonidec and Brizeux. The one astonished the world of learning by showing in his Breton grammar and dictionary that the language, called obselete and dead, was living and rich; the other, the poet, and in the Breton tongue the pupil of Le Gonidec, sang of his own land till Paris associated in one admiration the Breton and the country of his love. He struck the key-note in *Marie*, he out-poured all the harmony of his heart in *Les Bretons*. He gathered the traditional thoughts and feelings of his race into the songs of *Telen Arvor*, the "Harp of Armorica," and brought together and translated into French their fireside wisdom and popular sayings in *Furnez Breiz*. No sketch, however short, should part the name of Auguste Brizeux from that of Brittany. Another worthy name in the bringing to light of the remote province is that of M. de la Villemarqué. It was his work to tell the history of the Breton tongue, to collect the *Barzas Breiz*, the songs sung by generations of its people, to publish for the nineteenth century its ancient legends, its mystery plays of the Middle Ages, the poetry of its cloisters. He was the only man who could have so exquisitely moulded the epilogue on *La Poésie Bretonne*, which closes the *Bretagne Contemporaine* edited by M. Charpentier. This last work is the latest and grandest outcome of Breton patriotism. Though the three large folios, an *édition de luxe* on a huge scale, are published at Paris, every part of them, even to the paper and the printer's types, comes from the province itself. As we turn over the leaves, the full-page lithographs seem to be innumerable; every one is from sketches on the spot by a Breton artist, graven afterwards on the stone by Breton hands. The letterpress, taking each of the five departments in turn, is the work of writers who know well the past and present of their own land. They do not deal in long florid descriptions, nor do they lower a single page to the level of a tourist's guide. They attend to their one simple task of record-

ing the history and present state of every part of the province, describing briefly what is most noteworthy in the towns. A few pages of history begin the first volume, a few more of epilogue end the last, completing a perfect chronicle of the province, an unimpassioned tribute of praise, a national work destined to be enduring. Such a plan of treating the subject is too vast and too detailed even to guide us here. Our sketch can only deal broadly with three points—the country, its people, the influence of religion on their lives—but our few pencil strokes have to suggest the same Brittany, the length and breadth of which is depicted, as a slow labour of love, in *La Bretagne Contemporaine*.

First, as to the land itself, its strongly-marked features make it easily form in the mind something between a map and a picture. The peninsula strikes out into the Atlantic, its eastern end having, at the juncture with the rest of France, on the one side the coast of Normandy leaving the tide-washed sands of St. Michael at the angle, and turning northward soon to approach the Channel Islands; at the other side, below the Loire, the long southward-sweeping coast of old Poitou, the first department there beyond the boundary of the province being the Vendée of La Rochejaquelein. Two chains of mountains, or rather of high bare hills, run parallel in the north, not skirting the coast, but keeping inland, the more southern lying almost along the centre of the province. As the position of these mountains would suggest, the land has a general slope from the rugged north down to the undulating plains and low-lying sandy shores of the south; and the coast line is granite-built along most of the north, and in the extreme west, where Finistère thrusts oceanward its two great rocky promontories against wave and tempest. At the south the rocks are fewer; there are no long granite out-works against the sea, but level sand, low islets and foamy reefs; and there we find the coast receding from the water, and formy its small part of the long inward-sweeping curve where the great Bay has scooped out the west of the continent. Though Brittany is not now what it was in Chateaubriand's day, his words are still the best description of its southern *landes*, where he says that "a traveller on foot might journey for days without seeing anything but wild heaths and sandy shores, and a sea whitening against a multitude of reefs—a desolate region, dreary and stormy, with brooding fogs or lowering clouds; where the noise of the wind and of the waves is eternal." Nor are these the only uncultured districts. Heath and moor alternate with the rich and smiling valleys, and higher, in the mountain regions, there are roads that wind for miles through purple wastes of heather and

bramble, or an all but endless wilderness of dry earth and gold-tipped broom. But down between the spurs of the hills, where the shallow streams of summer become in the wet season broad and swift floods, there are tracts of green country, where the thatched houses, village churches of granite, and white gleaming crosses, look out across pasture lands, or from bowers of round billowy trees and orchards white with bloom. A great part of the south, but still more of the north, the old country of Léon and Tréguier, is as beautiful in green and luxuriant abundance as are the hills and heaths in barrenness. There the land is tilled and the seed strewn in the furrows by men who know that the harvest ripens and the mill-wheel turns for their own cottage homesteads. The sickles are swung by neighbours' arms in "white straw month;" and earlier in the year the brown hands of men and women, who have grown up together, leave only broken earth in the potato-fields, where seas of lilac blossom shone but lately beyond the hedges. Those hedges tell us at once that we are in sunny France, though in its wildest part. Their hawthorn, red and white, that in summer scents the deep-rutted roads, is festooned with an abundance of long-tangled sprays of sweeter honeysuckle. In the meadows the succession of the months bring forth a wild harvest of flowers—fresh lavender and pale starry primroses (the Breton children's "milk-flowers"), and then the briar-roses and the wild hop covering waste corners and warm hillsides with trailing wreaths. As for that part of the east of Finistère spreading in towards the high land, and once the See of St. Pol de Léon, it may be called the garden of Brittany; and its land teeming with luxuriance, and its roads covered with crosses, shrines, and chapels, prompted Émile Souvestre to declare that it seemed as if its holiness brought the blessing of fruitfulness; "one can see, by only looking at it, that it is a favoured land beloved by the saints of Paradise."

There is yet another feature of the province, its fisheries on the long northern and broken western coast. Once the wreckers of Finistère plied a remorseless trade with craft driven in by the Atlantic storms, or lured to destruction by false beacons; but now, though like all coast dwellers they make use of chance wreckage when they can, the bad old times have passed away for them as for our own men of Cornwall, and no less than twenty-eight lighthouses glimmer at night from all the points jutting furthest from the treacherous shore-line. The fishermen of Côtes du Nord, once known as the diocese of Tréguier, leave behind them bright and pleasant shores, when they put out towards the great island group that lies far off between them and the narrowing channel. Their homes are at the head of

the bays, busy villages of clustering red houses, with the slated roof and spire of the church, and perhaps the flag of the coast-guard station rising above them. Out between those creeks and bays run massive piles of red granite, towering over the waves that surge against their bases, or, as they have been well described, lying "like so many sphynxes crouched amid the foam of the sea." A modern painter has of late years made English eyes wonder incredulously at his glimpses of other coasts of the same character as this—shores marvellous in their union of bold and magnificent form, with strong sunshine and glowing colour, where the scarped and worn rocks have a radiance of their own, and the waters that wash them are full of opalescent light.

In Brittany, to a singular degree, the features of the mother-country seem to be reflected in the character of the people. Brave by nature, staunch and loyal, they bear some likeness to the unyielding granite coasts that for centuries have held their own against the waves. Loving peace, content with simple goods, happy when the fields bring forth plenty, and resigned when the rain ruins the harvest, they have some resemblance to their own valleys—bright and peaceful, with many a cross and group of Calvary pillars looking upward, while the soil awaits the will of the Heaven that blesses it. Earnest and thoughtful, with a touch of melancholy even in their festivities and in their songs, they remind one of their own memory-haunted moors, wind-swept and cloud-covered, and strewn with *dolmens* and *menhirs* of a forgotten past.

The home of this Breton race is not actually, and never was, the whole of that tract of country which is known as Brittany. The province is usually described as being divided, since 1790, into five departments—to the east, Loire Inférieure and Ille et Vilaine; farther west, almost equally dividing the peninsula, Côtes du Nord, where its name indicates, and Morbihan, with its wild *landes*, stretching from the south coast to meet it at a boundary marked by the mountains; lastly, Finistère, all the extreme west of the peninsula. Now, of these five departments only three are really Breton, and a part of the two others. Loire Inférieure was to a great extent French from the earliest times, and is almost thoroughly so at the present day, if we except the Guérande peninsula lying next to Morbihan. As for the district called after its two rivers Ille et Vilaine, the old costumes and provincial life are to be found only in a few spots along its coast, its Breton part being the west, which once was included in the diocese of Tréguier. It is a curious proof of the religious character of the people that the four old Breton Sees, S. Pol de Léon, Cornouaille, Tréguier, and Vannes, still indicate the best

division of the province, excluding as they do the French part of the two eastern departments, and separating the people not by new and arbitrary boundaries, but according to characteristics and customs which have grown up with time. So firmly does tradition bind this race, that the inhabitants of each of the four old divisions are still distinguished by certain peculiarities of dialect, costumes, and usages. Still amongst themselves they preserve the old names, and talk of the men of Léon, of Tréguier, of Vannes, or the *Kernévotes* of the south-west. They have yet a popular rhyme which in its rough satire makes the four races among themselves as distinct as any of the three beyond the Channel. "Here," it runs, "is a good old saying—

"Vain and light as a Frenchman,
Hard and wicked as an Englishman,
Proud as a Scotchman,
Stupid as a Vannetais (Morbihan),
Rough as a Cornouaillais,
Thievish as a Léonnais,
False as a Trégorrais."

It is hard to decide from what region this "good old saying" could first have come; but there is only too much reason to fear that all four agree in at least one of its lines, and have some sort of lurking suspicion of the nationality commonly called "Jean l'Anglais." At the same time it should not be forgotten that our friends across the Channel have a still better old saying, and perhaps believe in it more: "Good horses of every colour; good people in every country."*

Beside differences of dialect and habits, there are marked peculiarities of costume in the various parts of the province. For instance, in the Guérande, and in some parts of Morbihan and southern Finistère, it has all the gaiety and colour of the conventional peasant-dress of romance. The men wear broad-leaved hats, the brim turned up at one side, being set at a different angle if the wearer be a young man, or if he be married, or if a widower. The coats are covered in front with braiding, and the white or black gaiters are embroidered, or else long red stockings are tied with ribbon at the knee. In the north of Finistère the style of dress is entirely different. The Léonnais gathers his coarse and dark loose coat under a belt of red or blue; and the women, instead of the infinite variety of the rest of the north and most of the south, wear simple black and white, which in widowhood they exchange for blue. The head-dress of the *Bretonne* has no form that can be called characteristic of the province, because it is to be found in each dis-

* A béb liou marc'h mäd, a béb vrô tûb väd.

trict in countless shapes, displaying every degree of taste, from that of the girl who goes wearing a tower of lace and muslin to the *pardon* of St. Anne d'Auray, down to that of the woman of Guérande, who is content to tie a close cap round her face, or swathe her head like a mummy. But in the appearance of the men there is one peculiarity to be found over the whole of Brittany; it is the wearing of the hair long, hanging in wild, scant locks, or loose *boucles* to the shoulder. In our days, whether wrapped in the national *blouse* and toiling in the fields, or in holiday attire thronging the road of a pilgrimage, they are still to be seen keeping the distinctive mark of what was once the long-haired warrior race.

The language, which is still spoken over most of the west, except in the large towns, is a Celtic tongue like Welsh and Gaelic. So great, indeed, is its similarity to Welsh, that the people of both countries can make themselves understood, as if speaking two very different dialects; and the sailors of Breton colliers sometimes converse with their distant cousins on the quays of Cardiff by using their native language, for which the only substitute they know, French, would in that case be unintelligible. The peculiarities of the Breton tongue make it an inviting subject for students, who find in the depth of its Celtic nature a trace of alliance to Sanscrit in the softening and entire changing of most of its consonants when they are placed after certain others. This peculiarity is not so well preserved in any other modern language. The native lips make the changes naturally, but they surprise and mystify the stranger almost at every second word.*

Just as the language of the people tells their origin, the ruins and remains scattered over the land tell their history. Druidic circles abound, huge upright *peulvans*, and still greater solitary *menhirs*. Trehorentec is "the garden of tombs," the plain of Lanvaux is strewn with more than a hundred stones; above all, Carnac carries us back into a depth of antiquity and mystery, where no light from our days can reach. It is no wonder that the peasant of Morbihan, passing under the shadow of those giants of Carnac, is filled with an instinctive dread, and hears the souls of the dead wandering in the wind; and that superstition haunts the plain. There was once a weird story that he who passed by Carnac Church at midnight would see the windows lighted up, for within Death in surplice and stole was preaching to the crowd of skeletons that for the hour

* See the popular saying quoted in a former note, where *mâd* and *vâd* both mean *good*, but the *m* has been softened to *v*. The consonants that change are *b* to *v*, *d* to *g*, *k* to *z*, *gw* to *w*, *m* to *v*, *p* to *b*, *t* to *d*, and *s* to *z*.

had left the Churchyard empty. It is pleasanter to hear the legend of St. Cornelius explaining that the eleven long lines of upright stones at Carnac were once soldiers in hot pursuit of the saint, until he, finding himself near the sea, stopped them effectually by a stupendous miracle. No doubt the country folks who tell such a tale have a shrewd idea that it was never more than an odd fancy, but it corresponds strangely enough with a late theory that those long orderly ranks of towering stones stretching across the plain were set up as a military monument commemorative of an army. Modern engineering works have altered and swept away some of the lesser remains in Brittany; and unexplained causes have been at work with time to lay others low, like the wonder of Locmariaker, the monolith sixty feet high, which now lies in the dust. It was to this land, where a pagan worship was carried on in wilderness and forest by scattered tribes, that in the fifth and sixth centuries came the forefathers of the Bretons. As we are told by the monk St. Gildas, one of the apostles of Brittany, they were no fugitive barbarians that reached the Armorican shores, swept from their own land of Britain by the Saxon fire and sword. They landed in successive bands upon the rocky north of the peninsula, which they had chosen as a place of refuge, not only because of its position, but because it was desolate and in great part uninhabited; and their settlement upon the Continent was far from being all a scene of battle and massacre, as it has been sometimes represented. There was in it the element of the coming of the Christian religion. The *dolmen* became the pedestal for the cross, the solitude of the forests changed to the home of the saints and their followers, who tilled the cleared lands for a scanty harvest. In a few years the Breton colony was ruled by a Bishop Mansuetus, who sat at the Council of Tours in 461, and he was reigning over his spiritual realm of peace, while Reothime, the Breton chief, was out with his long-haired warriors against the Visigoths. To this day the towns and villages of Brittany prove by their names that if the first Bretons were feared in battle, their life of peace went on at the same time in hamlet and cloister with great fruit of holiness. A mere list of the founders of the monasteries gives name after name to which the popular voice accorded the title of saint. The primitive forests were taken to make seclusion for the early monasteries by St. Samson at Dol, St. Suliac on the right of the river Rance, St. Lunaire on the left; St. Brieuc and St. Briau; St. Eflam, St. Paul Aurelian and St. Goulven; St. Kirec, St. Hervé, St. Urvoi, St. Gouëznou; St. Ténénan and Guennolé; St. Corentin and St. Ronan and St. Gildas: these and many

more are the fathers of the Breton Faith. The coming of the cross was not to be forgotten in our sketch, but the after-history of the land is outside our subject. When Henry VIII. was reigning in England, and Francis I. beyond the Channel, the province ceased to be a dukedom, and passed under the dominion of France; but it retained its own parliament until the great Revolution. That was a terrible time for Brittany. The wayside crosses were cast down literally by the hundred, the churches raised in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, countless and marvellously beautiful, were pillaged and wrecked. But the men of Morbihan rose in the night and dragged down the trees of liberty. The Bretons, in the war of La Vendée and in the wild peasant fighting of the *chouannerie* on their own soil, wrote their protest in blood against the Revolution; and struggling with the Republican "Blues" within hearing of the bells of their own shrines, they clung with the tenacity of the race to their double inheritance, their Faith and their loyalty. So it is that we can read the story of Brittany upon its own ground. The mounds and *menhirs* tell of its early darkness. The wayside cross of stone, reared upon an altar of some shadowy long-forgotten deity, represents the coming of the light. The ruined castles, with their weedy moats and towers capped with pointed roofs, are haunted yet by the shade of the chivalry and valour, once proverbial of the Breton, and still his possession. The old manor-houses, the chateaux still tenanted, bear witness to long periods of peace; but the broken crosses of Finistère, the ruined "Calvaries" outside churches, whose carving has been ruthlessly broken away, these are the sad records of what Breton loyalty cost in the last years of the eighteenth century. Finally, the thousand shrines that still remain, the church at Auray, with its miraculous statue of St. Anne, the patroness of Brittany; St. Jean le Doigt, with its relic of the Baptist; Notre Dame de Bon Secours, and many more to which at the time of the "*pardon*," winds the procession of white-capped women and long-haired sturdy labourers, not in hundreds but in thousands—all these countless shrines are the enduring testimony to the Faith of the Brittany of our own day.

And now comes the question, what has that Faith done for the land? Let us take, one by one, each part of the triple charge brought against it. First: superstition. This term, when it refers to customs in a Catholic country, is made to include practices of religion and traditions of piety. But there is something to be said of it in the true sense of the word; afterwards we can pass on to the influence of that religion, whose holiest usages are daily insulted by the name. It cannot be denied that a vast number of superstitions are to be found

among the people, but these at least are the weird fancies of poets by nature, not of a debased and miserable race such as the Bretons are sometimes represented to be. It is not surprising to find many strange beliefs among the sailors of the coasts; and a few of them are curious enough to be worth noting. The St. Gildas fisherman, if his conscience has long been ill at ease, dreads that some night when he sleeps on shore he will be led out to embark in a black craft lying low in the water, but apparently empty; and once embarked, a sail will unfurl, and the boat will drift out to sea, with another added to her heavy freight of lost souls. On All Souls' Day the simple fishing folk see the spirits of the shipwrecked in the white surf of the tide, and imagine them floating landward, a soul on every wave, hailing each other, or struggling together wherever the white crests are meeting with a sob and rush of surge. That night in many a village the supper and the fire are left ready for those who will come back from the other world to visit their old homes. For these pensive and imaginative minds, when the wind moans softly at nightfall, the dead are saying their evening prayer; when the moonlight shines on the uneven base of some stone raised ages ago, the fairies are there, not tricky elves, but tall white-robed women, bright as lamps, who haunt the circles and the roofed grottoes of huge blocks, and are wedded to the *poulpicans*, the genii of the earth. These are a few of their quaint fables and fears. Others relate to throwing bread into St. Michael's well, to recover lost property; touching the *routers*, or rocking stones of Pontivy, sending a lighted torch to sea, that it may drift towards the body of the drowned; or securing the burnt sprig of broom from the fire of St. John's Eve. Such customs as the two last are probably traceable to the old Druidic times; but the lighting of St. John's fires is a now harmless yearly festival, kept up in all Celtic nations, and not unknown beyond them, and it is of course a substitute in Christian times for some similar practice in a pagan age. As to the superstitions which have survived from that time, or sprung later into being, they are as distinct from the piety of the people as are the weeds from the wheat of the field; and such weeds are to be condemned none the less because they bear the attractive blossom of poetry. To return from this digression upon superstitions properly so-called, we may note, before passing on, how that poetry which colours those superstitions seems to be a natural product of the Breton soil. As in other countries which we call primitive, the gift of Brizeux lies in many a peasant heart, "wanting," as Wordsworth says, "the accomplishment of verse." The race is yet in the simplicity of its childhood. It has not learned to suppress ardent feeling, or

disguise it in formality; and here the outspoken word often reveals a noble current of thought, inspired by familiarity with the natural beauty of the country and the supernatural beauty of religion. "It's grand to be alive to-day!" says the labourer touching his hat to the stranger on the road, and expressing in a word his exuberant joy that the summertime is so glorious in his own land. He will speak of the coming autumn, and call it, in his own tongue, the winter-summer, the summer-ending, the sweeper of the leaves. For him the harvest is the month of white straw, with a whole picture of country life in the name. He gives a common-place thought a quaint turn that transforms it into poetry, and he that listens and reflects is at once startled, admiring and amused, like the Londoner of whom an Irish haymaker asked, with a touch of his hat, "What was the age of the daylight?" But in Brittany the most beautiful expressions are those inspired by religion. Ask the mother how many children she has? "Three," she will answer, perhaps, "and I gave two to the good God." If she is a woman of the fisheries, ask, where is her husband? "He is out on the good God's sea." And the sailor himself has a prayer that is a poem—"My God, protect me; my ship is so little, and Thy sea so great!"

And now to proceed to the answer to what is meant by the charge of superstition, we may take a few instances of the traditional practices and effects of religion among the Bretons, glancing at religion as shown in times of sorrow; in mutual charity; in marriages and festivities; in pilgrimages; and in the influence of the priesthood.

Faith in the wisdom and providence of "the good God" is interwoven with the whole of the Breton's life; and it gives him, if not fearlessness in the face of misfortune and death, at least a perfect resignation. When the cholera visited Finistère in 1832, even *Emile Souvestre*, who would have been but too likely to condemn this resignation as the fruit of ignorance rather than of piety, acknowledges, as a witness of these scenes, the blessing which religion brought to the people of the country, while those in the more "progressive" towns felt the scourge more heavily because of the irreligious spirit in which it found them. The Bretons, who were true to their national piety, knowing in those days more of the power of prayer than of medical science, prepared for the worst by making ready wide graves in the churchyards, and then before shrine and altar throwing themselves in life or death upon the mercy of God. Still, when death menaces the home of the Breton, his first thought is of his patron saints and of some shrine of the Madonna, where the burning taper is set to plead all day, till its flame dwindles to the socket, for the wife, child, or aged

father, who may never come to kneel there again. Beside their resignation, one of the most beautiful evidences of their piety is the charity of the poor to those who are poorer still. The orphan child is adopted into another home, in some instances the new mother being chosen by the priest of the district; and where the home is too poor to support another inmate, the neighbours pledge themselves each to give some portion of the little stranger's support. With them the needy are "God's guests." "When the poor man comes to your door," runs an old saying, "if you give nothing, speak to him courteously." And the usual salutation of the mendicant is the same as that also found in the mouth of the guest amongst the Celtic Irish—"God bless all here!" To which the inmates of the cottage answer, "and you also!" When the poorest are about to marry, the dowry of the bride is given in rustic fashion in kind, and the house furnished by the charity of friends; and the bride and bridegroom, who were in deepest poverty yesterday, ask the whole country-side that has enriched them to share their wedding festivities. A Breton marriage in all ranks of life, from the farmer of substance down to the most needy, makes a feast-day for the whole neighbourhood, and has its own curious customs. It is first arranged by the *bazvalan*, who is generally the village tailor, because that individual, who in Brittany receives an equal amount of confidence and of contempt, has access in his work to all the houses, and is accustomed to dine not at the first table where the men are served, but at the second with the women of the household. On the wedding morning he comes to the home of the bride, bearing the green sprig from which his name has come, *baz-valan*, "branch of broom." A long discussion, quaint and poetic, here takes place between him and the family of the house, who come one by one to answer his repeated inquiry whether they have seen the white dove he has lost. After many evasions the concealment of the white dove in the house is confessed, and the bride is introduced to meet her chosen husband, who is led in by the *bazvalan*; and this long and antiquated ceremony, which began with the words, "In the name of the Almighty Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, blessing be to this house and more joy than is mine," ends with the bride's invocation of her parents' blessing, and often a *De Profundis* for the departed. The old songs of the wedding feast are mournful in their character, and sung to monotonous music; and eminently characteristic of the Breton life is the "Song of the Bride," which is still chaunted to the repetition of a few changing notes, just as it was centuries ago in the days of "the good Duchess Anne." It begins by wishing a happy marriage to

the former companion of the girls who sing, and to "*Monsieur votre époux*." Then they remind her of the good counsels of the priest as to fidelity and love, having first sung how they will go now to festivity and dance, while "*Madame la mariée*" will go no more, but stay at home and take care of her house. They sing of her humble round of duties, and of the care she must have for her sheep and cows, and then the song, which is a perfect description of the life of the *Bretonne*, closes with "Receive this bouquet which we offer you; it is made of the wild broom (*genêt*) to remind you that all vain honours pass away like flowers." The accompanying music was for many generations the somewhat mournful tones of the national instrument, the *biniau*, a kind of bagpipes. Now the *biniau* has gone much out of use. Once it was heard at every "*pardon*" when the evening came, and the people, finding themselves gathered together, finished the work of the day with a dance of slow and measured movements. There is undoubtedly something strange in the custom of ending a pilgrimage with a dance, but probably the rejoicings amongst the young folks on the homeward road arose originally from some idea of the freedom and joy of the accomplished journey and the blessings of the "*pardon*." As to the frequentation of the taverns at such times, there is a word to be said, because it is made constantly an excuse for sneering at the spirit of the pilgrimages. In the pilgrimage of St. Anne d'Auray, between twenty and thirty thousand people throng annually to one spot from every part of the country. It is not surprising that among such a multitude there are many by whom the occasion is abused, and these, who compared with the rest are a small minority, are the few who attract the attention of the stranger. It is in a spirit of thorough unfairness that the pilgrims of Brittany are stigmatised as rough peasants who end their prayer in a drunken revel; a prejudiced traveller on this side of the Channel might as well take note of every sign of the disorderly element in the public holidays, or the weddings and funerals of the lower classes, and putting all his notes together charge the English honest working people with more abuse and irreverence than is ever set down to the Bretons. Again, the critical stranger, who is there to find fault, is apt to count amongst the disorderly the crowds of well-behaved and pious men and women, who have arrived and will go back to their homes footsore with a journey of many miles, and for whom the refreshment of the wayside inn is a necessity. Lastly, in many cases where the poor Breton of the pilgrimage disedifies the critical on-looker, it is acknowledged that the very frugality of his life makes him peculiarly unfit to bear the exchange of the cider of

his home for the wine of the town, or for the spirit to which instead of the French misnomer "water of life" the Breton gives a strangely appropriate name, "wine of fire," *guin-ardant*. So much for the few blots which it is the custom to magnify; for the rest the pilgrimages are in themselves seasons of renewed piety and blessing, and as regards the world living testimonies to the faith of the people. It is said that in no part of France are the churches filled as they are in Brittany, and when Christmas comes, no matter how inclement the season may be, the roads are covered with converging streams of country people, rosary in hand, making for the common centre, the village church and the midnight mass. Hours before, the twilight has been filled with voices far and near when the youths and girls were out at the wayside crosses, answering each other, or joining in the chorus of the *Noëls*. "Why," sang the men, "are those crowds upon the roads? Why do the people move in groups towards the church in the night?" "It is," answered the young maidens, "because to-day the Messiah is born. It is because to-day we adore our Redeemer." Then the youths again, "Why are there prayers night and day in the churches? Why do the priests say mass at midnight? Why do they say three?" "Because one must be glad to-day," came the answer; "to-day is accomplished the great mystery of the Nativity." Then all together broke into a chorus, like the whole hymn, full of beautiful teaching, "This night renews the plan of the world's life: this night creates again the children of Adam: this night fills our hearts with joy, and blots out the sin of Eve: this night gives us a Saviour full of sweetness and of love. Sing then, for it is His Feast, sing Noël, Noël!" These are the same simple truths that are told to the crowd in the churches. Peasants sing them at the roadside; men, peasant-born and anointed greater than kings, preach them from the pulpit with a God-given unction. The people listen to those sermons of their Breton priests not with stolid gravity, not with quiet silence. They have the Celtic outspoken enthusiasm, the mighty heart quickly moved and impatient of restraint. Women sob, and men beat their breasts. The multitude shudders at the thought of a lost eternity, and the overburdened soul prays aloud, unnoticed, and unconsciously. Yet the men who stir thus the depths of human nature have been but lately the *kloarëcks* of some college at Vannes, or Quimper, or Tréguier, or S. Brieuc; and before that, they were country youths perhaps in neighbouring villages or homesteads. But once the student days were over, the words of ordination spoken, the ministry begun, they had left, in truth,

father and kindred and risen suddenly to the principedom of another world. Should they go back to the old home, parents would kneel to them, brothers and friends would do humblest service to the anointed of God, older men would crave their words of counsel, till they, grown old in turn, would be in temporal as well as in spiritual things the fathers of their people. Veneration for the dignity of the priesthood possessed to this degree belongs to the Bretons, not only because they are Catholic, but because they are Celtic. The influence of their pastors and of their religion has given a solemnity as well as a graceful softness, not a weakness, to their character. Courtesy to the stranger is with them a national custom. They have not that polish and affectation of formal compliment which gave rise to the saying that every Spaniard is a gentleman; theirs is the better attribute of simple and frank Christian courtesy. The labourer on the country road does not walk stolidly by, kicking the dust before him. He raises his hand to his hat at the sight of a strange face, and exchanges a word; and if the traveller has the good luck to know the Breton tongue, he will understand the peasant's salutation, "God bless you!"

A good proof that all this is, indeed, the softening and beautifying, not the weakening, of the race, lies in the Breton's preservation to this day of his aptitude for military service and his national valour. Every war waged yet by the arms of France has counted Breton names in the ranks, and Breton blood in the price of its glory or in the penalty of its loss; while the French navy, with its chief arsenal on the coast of Finistère, is chiefly manned by the men of Brittany. It has been always so; since the days when the Duke Alain sent his five thousand men across the Channel with the Norman Conqueror, the hardy race has kept its character for readiness to serve at the first sound of war. The land of Du Guesclin in the old days has brought forth new heroes at each generation, and in later times claims many illustrious names, amongst them those of the family of Charette. If Breton bravery paid its tribute time after time to the victories of France, it gave still more generously for a cause even higher than that of country—the cause of the Church, the freedom of the Holy See. When the call of Lamoricière roused the Catholic world in 1860, the sons of Brittany came in answer from the château, from the workshop, from the furrowed field. All the time from Castelfidardo to the disbandment at Rome, their names were to be seen, noble and historic, humble and unknown, mingled in honourable numbers upon the list of the Zouaves. And those who are familiar with the sad but glorious history of the long struggle for the freedom of Rome will recognise such

names as those of Arthur de Chalus, Rogatien Picou, Joseph Guerin, Paul de Parcevaux, and his cousin of Quimper, Hyacinth de Lanascot. It would take a long roll-call to tell of the multitude of Bretons who sealed their faith with their blood under the white and yellow banner. Any one who glances at the chapter, called defiantly *Les Mercénaires** in M. Veuillot's history of the time, will find page after page filled with the record of Breton heroism, from the "glorious death" of Count Gaston de Plessis, "in the midst of the young heroes, amongst whom Brittany numbered so many of her sons,"† to the letter of farewell from the wounded carpenter, Gicquel, who offered gladly an equally noble sacrifice, but lived to go back to his bench and his tools. Nor should we forget the heroism of those who gave up freely the sons of their Breton homes in the hour of peril, the women of Brittany who at need were "valiant." It was the spirit at once of their religion and of their nation that gave to such as M^{me}. de Lanascot‡ the courage of the mothers of martyrs; and many unknown names in the remote depths of the province deserve an equal commemoration with hers.

We shall turn from the consideration of the devotion of the Bretons to the Church in word and in deed, and its influence softening, sanctifying, ennobling the rough strength of the national character; and next comes before us the second charge—ignorance. We have seen how they have realised the boast of their race, "If we die like Christians and like Bretons, we shall never die too soon;" and now we are told that this land of honesty, of simple faith, and of innate heroism is in a lamentably backward, almost a barbarous condition, because a large proportion of its people is illiterate.§ The statistics of

* "Le Piémont dans les États de l'Eglise," par Eugène Veuillot.

† Report of the *Journal de Rennes*.

‡ This truly valiant woman having hastened to Italy on hearing of her son's wounds, reaching his death-bed, heard him say, "I am happy, I have done my duty; mother, I am dying!" "My child," she answered, "God's holy will be done! Let us say the *Te Deum*." And before the breaking heart had finished the hymn of praise, her son had given his soul to God.

§ The Bretons have certainly not yet heard of the idea of making what is called "higher education" universal. They express their common-sense view of the *Bretonne's* domestic duties in saying, "Jeanne is Jeanne's servant; Jeanne and her servant churn the butter together." And imagining Jeanne carried to the opposite extreme (perhaps by local university examinations), they give her a place between the reprehensible and the impossible, in a quaint rhyme, which may be translated—

"A woman given to drinking wine,
A maid in Latin scholarly,
A suu too early come to shine—
God knows what their end will be!"

education in Côtes du Nord, given in the work edited by M. Charpentier, show that this department at least was, in 1865, in advance of many others in France; that during the previous thirty years it contained only eight communes that were without one or more schools; and that these schools were attended by forty-five thousand children, a number which is continually on the increase. It is not, of course, to be assumed that Finistère and Morbihan are in this respect equal to Côtes du Nord; but in these departments, too, the Christian brothers have laboured long; and throughout the land, in many a village school and church, the peasantry are taught the doctrines of the Faith and the duties of life—a far higher knowledge, and one more valuable to a nation than any that is imparted by School Boards. There are also the flourishing colleges at Vannes, Quimper, and other towns, where the students, or *kloarëcks*, from the noble house and from the labourer's family, study side by side in preparation for Holy Orders—the sons of the soil being in many cases distinguished above the rest by their high intelligence. Such teaching, whether in the college or in the depths of the country in the roadside school, has kept alive and cherished all that was true and loyal, all that was at once simple and noble, in the character of the people. But for even remote Brittany the battle has to be waged now against that greatest enemy of the Faith and of society—godless education.* The Prefect of Finistère but lately made war at one and the same time upon religious teaching in the schools, and the example of piety outside their walls in the public processions; and one of the last acts of the Prefect of Morbihan has been to force State schools upon the people of Vannes, by closing the school of the Christian brothers, which for more than ten years had been a public benefit to the city. What is to be the end of such times as these for Brittany if the people cannot effectually struggle against sowing in their children a harvest that, if it should spread and ripen, must be reaped by the old province yet with exceeding bitterness? As far as education is concerned, modern progress desires to make that loyal land at once un-Breton and un-Catholic. It is not many years ago since a champion of such progress thought he had hit upon a plan for playing off religion against patriotism, and patriotism against religion; and then was made the foul suggestion that the Breton priests should withhold First Communion from the children until they had passed the test of speaking French instead of their mother-tongue. And here, in view of the staunch faith

* The protests of Catholic Brittany against the Bill of M. Jules Ferry were amongst the first to be signed, and their outspoken language had the true ring of heroism.

and truth of this simple people, let another tell us, in nobler words than ours, of the wisdom of Christian ignorance as compared with un-Christian knowledge, and the bane which may come to such a land as Brittany by forcing it out of its native atmosphere of humble labour and opening the treasures of the French press of to-day to the tillers of the soil. A voice from the other side of the Atlantic will sum up the whole question for us in a few words, leaving us, perhaps, more content with this much-despised Breton ignorance.

"If the teaching of history is a trustworthy guide," says Dr. Spalding,* "we are certainly safe in affirming that civilised States and Empires perish, not from lack of knowledge, but of virtue; not because the people are ignorant, but because they are corrupt. . . . It is not knowledge, but character, that is important; and character is formed more by faith, by hope, by love, admiration, enthusiasm, reverence, than by any patchwork of alphabetical and arithmetical symbols. . . . The curse of our age is that men will believe that, in education, to spell, to read, to write, is what signifies, and they cast aside the eternal faith, the infinite hope, the divine love, that more than all else makes us men. . . . Is there some mystic virtue in printed words, that to be able to read them should make us men? And even in the most enlightened countries what do the masses of men know? Next to nothing; and their reading, for the most part, stupefies them. . . . These ignorant masses, who, in the common schools, have been through the Fourth Reader, and who know nothing, not even their own ignorance, are confused. They doubt, they lose faith, and are enlightened by the discovery that God, the soul, truth, justice, honour, are only nominal—they do not concern Positivists. Can anything be more pitiful than the state of these poor wretches?—neither knowing nor believing; without knowledge, yet having nor faith nor love. God pity them that they are Communists, Internationalists, *Solidaires*; for what else could they be? No enthusiasm is possible for them but that of destruction. Religion is the chief element in civilisation, and consequently in progress. . . . Man is more than his knowledge. Simple faith is better than reading and writing. . . . But we are not the advocates of ignorance. We will praise with any man the true worth and inestimable value of education. Even mere mental training is, to our thinking, of rare price. Water is good, but without bread it will not sustain life. Wine warms and gladdens the heart of man; but, if used without care, it

* "Essays and Reviews," by Right Rev. J. L. Spalding, D.D., Bishop of Peoria. "Essay on the Comparative Influence of Catholicism and Protestantism on National Prosperity."

maddens and drives to destruction. We are crying out against the folly of the age, which would make the school-room its church, education its sacrament, and culture its religion. It is the road to ruin."

This brings us to the third charge, which calls the Breton people culpably unprogressive. That is, they are accused of not having towns as wealthy, factories as numerous and full of labour, lands as scientifically cultivated as those of other parts of France. They do not make enough use of the printing press, and they were late with their railways; and because they happen to be pious as well as poor, all this is set down as coming decidedly, though in some indirect and inexplicable way, out of the influence of the Church. But these Bretons are not altogether without this world's goods—far from it. Their hills are loaded with rich veins of lead and iron, and the thews and sinews that were first tried in some village wrestling-match find the proper element for their persistent strength among the heat and noise of furnace and forge. The men seem to be specially fitted for the labours of the miner and the iron-worker, though when first they were made familiar with the giant power of steam their astonishment is said to have been like the half-fearful wonder of children. There are potteries, too, porcelain making, and some remains of a once prosperous cloth manufacture. Without anything like the perfection of agriculture in more advanced countries, the labourers upon the soil make it improve in the north from year to year, and in the flat undulating south are gradually reclaiming much of the waste ground for cultivation, while they use the broad *landes* for pasturage. The northern departments have their flourishing vineyards, where the living green covers trellised arcades, and the richer districts bring every kind of cereal to yellow ripeness; while in the south the orchards make the cultured tracts beautiful with their showers of blossom, and then yield a wealth of fruit to the cider presses. Once the whole land would have realised the famous apostrophe of Brizeux, "*O terre de granit recouverte de chênes!*" But long before his time most of the wooded ground, especially that of Morbihan, had been cleared. In the west, and still more in the north, the great forests remain, and ship-building on the coast and other kinds of industry in timber is carried on by means of the magnificent and unailing supply from such ground as Lorges, La Hunauday, Coat-an-nos, Boquen, Loudéac, and La Houdinaye. The fisheries along the coast, in creating a necessity for Breton-built craft, have led as a consequence to the working of hemp into every form, from stout cables down to cordage and twine, in native roperies. The

population of the shores makes, indeed, in many ways one of the most prosperous and important divisions of the people, and not only are their fishing smacks, like those of Normandy, scattered over the widening waters of the English Channel; their small vessels venture across the ocean to Newfoundland, where there is many a Breton to be found in the fisheries. Fearless of peril, and with a natural instinct for the enterprise of the sailor's life, the race, if it has not enriched its own province, has at least done no small service upon the sea for the larger country instead; and France, in her navy and in her merchant service, numbers between nineteen and twenty thousand of the men of Brittany. The splendid harbour on the coast of Finistère was fittingly chosen to become a naval port, and Brest to be the great arsenal of France. But Brest, with its life of nineteenth century business, its storehouses and modern public buildings, and its population of seamen, has grown into the least Breton town in Brittany. Nor, if one follows the canal cut through the length of the peninsula for bringing provisions to the fortress in time of war, will one find at the opposite southern extremity a thoroughly Breton town in old historic Nantes. The typical towns of Brittany are such as Quimper, or Quimperlé, or Dinan, or Carhaix, where the nineteenth century mingles with the seventeenth, or the sixteenth, or even an earlier period; where churches, that are prayers in stone, call to mind the bygone time when labour was grandly ambitious because the Christian and the artist and the workman were one. There are the streets where the antique carving of buttress and corner, the old granite portals below, the matchlessly uneven roofs above, mock the substantial and practical unsightliness of new, and perhaps more ambitious, dwellings. There the townsfolk of the olden time walk out as in the pages of a romance, or in the fancy of a dream, and talk about elections and railways; while the overhanging stories of the older houses nod across the narrow sunlight of the streets to busy shops of this trafficking age. What those towns need—what is needed by the whole country—is not the will and the power of labour, but the capital by which material for labour is supplied. The "little country" depends upon a greater country, and what is desirable from the rest of France is that it should help the province which was so long left almost as unknown ground, that out of its wealth it should give a better chance of prosperity to the *petite patrie*, offering thereby not luxury but more of the refinements of comfort, not false principles and godless teaching to delude the mind but honest work to occupy the hand. But if the maxims of '89 and the un-Christian schools of the State must needs come in these degenerate days with what

is called progress, better far that Brittany should let the more advanced peoples progress before her on the highway of the Revolution, and she standing in the background should wait God's time, keeping her old-world aspect, true to her traditional loyalty and to her ancient Faith.*

In opposition to the movement of false advancement which struggles to make way in the province from outside, there is a counter movement of true progress continually at work in the heart of the country. While the one seeks almost as its basis to bring the French language into general use, the other strives, as the best safeguard of religion and nationality, to keep alive the Breton tongue. Foremost in this work was for many years the Bishop of Quimper and Léon, Mgr. Marie-Joseph Graveran. He stands out, a noble and venerable figure, from the quiet history of his province in these later days. In his former See he is held in perpetual remembrance, known among the people by his old name of the *Biscop Gwenn*, the White Bishop, because long before he left them his hair was white, not with years, but with much care and many labours. The work of preserving the Breton language was undertaken by him as a sacred duty. He pressed his friends and priests into the task he had taken to heart, and in his zeal he was always forming fresh plans, and then seeking out those who were most willing and best fitted to execute them. While Le Gonidec was interesting the world beyond in what it called the revival of a dead language; while Brizeux was turning the thoughts of the capital towards his own furze-clad moorlands; while others were bringing wisdom and science to the task of telling of the glories of the old province,† the White Bishop had begun to publish, not new literature of Brittany, but Breton literature for the Bretons. He introduced

* Some fears for Breton truth to old principles will have been aroused by recent events in Morbihan, where not only was the Count de Mun defeated in the election at Pontivy, but a boisterous crowd assembled outside his house the same night, and the Marseillaise was sung in the streets. But we should bear in mind that Pontivy had three times the honour of being represented by the man who is pre-eminently in France the champion of God and of the right; that, after a fourth election by an overwhelming majority, he was only defeated by intimidation and official candidature, and that he himself addressing his 10,000 supporters thanked them for the "indomitable courage," without which they could not have remained faithful despite the manoeuvres employed against them; adding a few words which we may repeat for the sake of the fame of the Morbihannais—"Votre ancien député restera le vrai représentant de vos sentiments et de vos convictions. Mes amis, confiance et courage! L'avenir est à nous! Nous nous sommes levés pour Dieu; Dieu ne nous abandonnera pas."

† We should not here pass over without reference the very valuable labours of Dom le Pelletier and the French Benedictines.

into his diocese a Breton branch of the Association for the Propagation of the Faith, and published the annals in the native tongue; but as the publication was meant to reach people who knew little of printed books, the first part was prefaced by an introduction in verse, each couplet beginning with a different letter, so as to furnish a popular alphabet. The editor he chose was the Abbé Henry, who afterwards under his patronage published a collection of the national hymns, and having translated the Old Testament into Breton, wrote in the same language a "Life of our Lord" in the words of the four Evangelists. At the same time the *Histor Briez* was written, the history of Brittany told like a fireside story; and this work also was inspired by Mgr. Graveran. It was under his patronage, too, that the *Revue d'Armorique* was carried on, which afterwards became the *Revue de Bretagne et de la Vendée*. Brittany has now a well-represented newspaper press; and the successor of the *Biscop Gwenn* in the See of Quimper and Léon founded in 1865 the Breton *Feiz ha Briez* ("Faith and Brittany"). Thus has the influence of the Church given a new impetus to Christian learning in the old province in our days, and the people whose language it fostered are well worthy of having a noble literature of their own;* since in bygone times it was so largely their possession that they had wealth to give away to those who would borrow the stories of their history, the legends recorded by their monks, or further back still the half-fabulous tales of chivalry sung by their bards—romances, weird scenes, and bright fancies, that have been brought into our own literature again and again, from the time when under the Norman monarchs Court poets traced the path for the laureate of to-day.

Even now in tradition-loving Brittany the bard of the old times lives in the street minstrel, who chaunts his story or his lament for the evening-crowd in the market-place or on the church steps. The verses thus sung frequently relate to recent events, with that same instinct for telling the news abroad which we find in the English ballad; but with the Bretons, instead of being rough rhyme, it is often impassioned poetry, composed perhaps by some native poet, whose work in the French tongue is not quite unknown outside the province. As an example of the subject and the poem chosen by the Breton nineteenth-century minstrel, we shall take a few words from the impassioned lament which M. de la Villemarqué heard sung at Quimper. The man stood near the door of the cathedral, and

* In paying our tribute to national genius in Brittany, the name of Chateaubriand has not been mentioned. Though a son of the province, he seems not to have preserved any of the natural Breton affection for the "*petite patrie*." His sympathies were French, and so was his genius.

he was singing for a handful of *sous* ; but he knew what would win the crowd. Within the portal, at a distance of but a few paces, lay the white effigy of Mgr. Graveran, and it was of the *Biscep Gwenn* that the singer chaunted in sorrowful monotone "Once it was sad," he sang, "to see towers of the cathedral of Quimper; for four centuries they had remained unfinished. One day he said gently, with a smile,—'My children build the spires of St. Corentin;' and forthwith came the men of Cornonaille, of Léon, even of Tréguier, to offer their *sous* to the good Bishop, and the white spires of Quimper carried up to heaven their witness to the Faith of the Bretons. . . . Priests and people, and you, ye poor of Jesus, widows, orphans, all the afflicted, you have lost your friend, your pastor, your father. Oh ! Bretons, how our hearts are breaking ! . . . Good pastor come down from Heaven again, and from the height of our cathedral towers bless the country that you loved. Bless the poor, the sad, our sailors, our soldiers, all the Breton people. Bless, too, the graves where our fathers and our mothers are sleeping. Ask from God that we may keep our Faith, the old Faith of Gralon, and of Gwenolé, the Faith of the saints of Brittany, so that on the world's last day there may yet be Bretons kneeling in prayer at (Our Lady's shrine of) Rumengol!"

It was in 1855, before the workmen's scaffoldings were removed from the rising spires of St. Corentin, that the *Biscep Gwenn* had been summoned away from his devoted people. A few years after his death great changes came. The quaint old town of Quimper was startled by the coming of steam in 1863, and two years after the iron paths of the railway were not only to be found in a continuous line encircling the whole province like a belt along the coasts, but the trains swept also through the mountains and straight across the centre from S. Briec at the north to Auray, of holy memories, in the south of Morbihan. The coming of the railway to Quimper was hailed by some lovers of old Brittany with a cry of despair. There was even a circular sent round to the principal towns-people inviting them to be present at "the funeral procession of the manners, customs, language, and traditions of Armorican-Brittany, dying to-day in the nineteen-hundredth year of her age,"—the ceremony to take place to-morrow at the railway station. But there was no real cause for that melancholy satire, and those who knew the province best were far from sharing in the agitation. "Let steam come," writes M. de la Villemarqué, "no one will be afraid of it. Our skies will not be less blue, our valleys less verdant, . . . our giants of Carnac less immovable, our bells less bravely rung, our crosses

less strong, our disdain less supreme for the scoffers who walk past insulting them. The noise of the locomotives will not drown the holy chimes of our churches, nor put down the voice of our two thousand Breton priests; for, even less than us, are they afraid of smoke! Like every good thing He has created, God has made this for the service of man." And then he goes on to note two services that have been already done by the establishment of the railways—the bringing of the various parts of the province into closer relation with each other, and the closing of many of the inns which tempted the traveller on now disused roads. Unfortunately since that time the prefects under the Republic have permitted the traffic in intoxicating drinks to increase to an extent which must be greatly regretted; for intemperance is certainly too often the one fault of the honest, hard-working, and home-loving Bretons. It was a failing to which their noble qualities did not blind Mgr. Graveran, and he would exclaim with mingled sorrow and pride, "My Breton people, the day that, without stopping, you pass by those accursed taverns, that day you will be the first people on the earth."

It is well to think that, in these years, while more and more about simple Brittany rises the unholy tide of new and false teaching, there are yet men fired with the zeal of the *Biscope Gwenn* to hold it back, to keep it from pressing forward from the frontier of France and inward from the coasts. They have the same love for the brave old province, the same realisation of the necessity of keeping it Breton if they would keep it Catholic; and Mgr. Graveran's opinion of the value of the native tongue has been confirmed by Pius IX., in one of his marvellously significant words spoken to the Abbé Léséleuc—"Guard," he said, "as the apple of your eye, that language which preserves your Faith." Nor was it alone the language of the Bretons that the zealous prelate laboured in his time to preserve. He had the hardihood to declare that he would not have them put aside their old customs or their national costume, lest that polish of civilisation, which the world said they needed, might be also a wearing down, an effacing of the precious imprint of their religious character. "Have respect for yourselves as Christians," he said; "that title has not its equal upon earth in grandeur and in promise. Esteem yourselves as Bretons; that name, when it is borne as it should be, is a pledge of attachment to the old Faith, of fidelity to the practices of religion, of constancy in the path of duty."

ART. VI.—THE DEMANDS OF IRELAND.

1. *Rules and Regulations of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland.* Dublin. 1869.
2. *Irish Intermediate Education Bill, Ireland.* House of Commons. 1878.
3. *A Bill to make Better Provision for University Education in Ireland.* House of Commons. 1879.

THE law under discussion at present throughout France may be taken to represent the extreme anti-Catholic position on the question of education. Between it and the sound Catholic education theory, a multitude of schemes, some unorthodox, some temporizing, some orthodox but impracticable, commend themselves to the intelligence, and engage the zeal, of the numberless speculators on the subject. A question of policy with one set of men, a question of expediency with another, a question for Parliament, a question for poor-law boards, a question for prison boards, a question at the hustings, a question at the election of a town councillor, a serious question for the pater-familias, education, secular or religious, is the topic most widely discussed, most generally agitated about in this quarter of the century, the nineteenth of our Christian era. France, always in advance in revolutionary movements, has taken the matter in hand, and proposes to make a wholesale change in the education system. Hitherto, religion and education were permitted to have something in common. If religion was not made part of the *curriculum* of the Lycée or the college, it was at least permitted as an *ad libitum* object of study, and men and women were not excluded from the office of teaching simply and solely because they were religious. The teachers of France, who are religious, may be counted at this moment by tens of thousands, and zeal for their work and efficiency are their recognized characteristics. The proposed legislation contemplates cancelling at once the privilege of teaching for all persons guilty of membership in any religious order, congregation, or community whatsoever, not recognized by the State, the State recognizing scarcely any. Education is not to be allowed to come in contact with the religious element at any point. Such is the tenor of the Bill of M. Jules Ferry, French Minister of Instruction. We shall not now go into its clauses in detail. It is sufficient to say of it, that it constitutes religion a positive disqualification for any post connected with education, from the village schoolmastership to the Council of Public Instruction.

The tendency of legislation such as this is obvious, and the motives of the legislators are not difficult to interpret. Society is to be un-Christianized, and by consequence uncivilized. They mean the first result, they think they do not mean the second, but never was there a more inevitable sequence. Christianity made education a special object of its care from the beginning, an anxious and a troublesome charge, but it was necessarily wound up with the mission of the Church. At first it was the task of unteaching men views and ideas and ways that could not be adapted to the law of Christ. Afterwards it was the less painful, but still equally solicitous task of training and fashioning young minds, as they developed into thoughtfulness, to the ways and views and ideas that should be found in Christian men. The solicitude demanded was unremitting and comprehensive. It could not afford to slumber or take respite, it could not venture to leave out of its charge any serious occupation, indeed any occupation or circumstances, of those whom, on the day of their baptism, it had taken under its protection. It had to correct and humanize a people who, with all their literary and artistic culture, found a pleasure, nay, an enjoyment, in witnessing the savage encounters of half-naked gladiators, and who did not think a holiday worth having unless they beheld the floor of their amphitheatre overflowing with blood. It had to tone down the pride and ferocity of the masters and conquerors of the world, and mould them to the meekness and humility of Christ. It had to expurgate their learning of all that was gross and degrading in doctrine, and filthy and revolting in morals. It had to take painting and sculpture and architecture under its direction, and detaching the artist's mind from pagan forms, create within it new, pure, and ennobling conceptions. This is the work of education which Christianity has had to do, concurrently with the announcing of the Gospel and the ministry of the sacraments, a work not effected once for all, but always being effected continuously, perseveringly. It goes on, but it is not always successful, it is constantly checked, it is sometimes spoiled, in particular localities it is at times effaced, for it has the world and the powers of darkness incessantly opposing it from without, and, even as in Christ's own day, traitors will be found within the Church, dishonouring the trust that has been confided to them.

The present hour of trial is, then, though severe indeed, not a singular or exceptional incident in the history of the Church's relations to education, nor is France the only country engaged in the struggle between the Church and secularism. Germany, in her Falk laws, has almost proscribed Catholic education. The secular party in Belgium is as zealous about the evil work as their greater neighbours, to whom they are second in range of

influence, not in perversity of will. In England, although a noble protest has been entered against Jules Ferry's Bill as unfair and equivalently unconstitutional, religious education for Catholics labours under deplorable disadvantages. But Ireland it is, with its vast Catholic population, representing a majority of five to one of the inhabitants of the country, all demanding a system of education consistent with the principles of the faith they profess, that has most to complain—that is, in reality, most sorely aggrieved. The small fractional share which the Catholics of Ireland have in the law-making of the Empire must leave them, for the legislation which they desire, to the justice, the equity or the policy of the, for the time being, prevailing majority. The grievance is very often descanted on with allusion to the past history of the Irish Church, but we fear that this is only waste of breath. That the Catholic Church in Ireland was foully wronged, that the donations of Catholic men were seized on by the high hand and diverted from the purposes for which they were made, and in many instances converted to purposes the most opposite to the intentions and declarations of the donors, is a fact that will not admit of question; but what can be the profit of preaching the necessity of restitution to those who do not believe in the obligation of restitution? Governments, in the matter of Church property, do not believe in restitution. Commutative justice on this score is not a State virtue; but distributive justice ought to be. The Catholics who bear in common with their Protestant fellow-countrymen the burdens of the Empire should, in common with their Protestant fellow-countrymen, be made sharers in the privileges and advantages of the Empire. Through some fatally misguided policy this has not yet been done for Irish Catholics. It is not our purpose, nor is it within our present scope, to investigate the causes of this maladministration. "Nothing will satisfy the Catholics of Ireland; they are in a state of chronic discontent," is the response of one political party. "The Irish have shown themselves so ungrateful for favours already received, they do not merit further consideration," is the excuse of another. If we sow the wind we know what we must expect to reap. The penal enactments enforced against Irish Catholics down to a comparatively recent date yielded a rich produce of alienation and discontent, and though the seed be not continued to be sown, it takes time and treatment to root out a crop that has once occupied the ground. The persistent refusal to accord equal educational privileges and provisions to Catholics as to Protestants is not the kind of treatment to eradicate discontent. Liberals and Conservatives both have been poor husbandmen, so far as the soil of Ireland is concerned. Then, for the plea of ingratitude, nowhere over

the broad face of the earth is there to be found a more grateful people, a people more tenacious of memory for service done; but human gratitude is not like the plant and flower which the Indian juggler produces from a seed before your eyes by some instantaneous process. To render a man grateful it is not enough to say to him, "I have done you a great service." Before the heart can be moved it must be seen and felt that the thing is done, and that it is a service. We shall probably refer to this point again, and show what little ground any of the political parties have for charging the Catholics of Ireland with ingratitude, and how mightily some politicians overrate and overstate the service they have done to Irish Catholicity.

But putting aside the makeshift explanations of rival political parties, wishing to account for their not doing what they are either unable or unwilling to do, the admitted fact stands up plainly before us, that in all educational endowments and provisions the Catholic people of Ireland have been, and continue to be, most inequitably treated. It is now plain that the first project was to Protestantize them by proscribing Catholic teaching and Catholic teachers under the penalties of misdemeanour and felony, at the same time surrounding Protestant teaching with all possible rewards and privileges. For a long weary period of trial and of temptation—(we say temptation, for the Irish Catholic thirsts for education)—this project was worked, but little or nothing came of it. Penalties for Catholic teaching no longer exist. The Catholic no longer teaches or learns at his own risk, but he does so still at his own expense. Mr. Gladstone proposed a Bill of University Education for Ireland in 1873, by which existing disabilities and inequalities were to be adjusted, as it was hoped, but alas! the disability of poverty for the Catholic and the inequality of endowment for the Protestant were to remain as unadjusted as ever. The Queen's University and Queen's Colleges have been now some thirty years in operation, and notwithstanding the facilities afforded for matriculation, they present but a wretched roll of students for the enormous outlay of public money. Yet we cannot say that there is a want of desire amongst our legislators to bring about a satisfactory settlement of the question. Many attempts have been made, and in some instances with great exercise of ingenuity, to bring the various parties interested in the subject to converge to a common basis of legislation, but up to the present all have ended in abortion. The late Mr. Butt brought his large intellect and high legal cultivation and experience to the framing of an Irish University Bill, which was extinguished by a breath. This very year a marked Government measure on the lines of the Intermediate Education Bill was actually pre-

pared, and whilst wise and thoughtful men in authority were engaged in the necessary preliminary details, it was rudely and suddenly extinguished. The irrepressible and baneful Orange element of Irish Conservatism, with the co-operation of a certain fanatical English clique, had its way. So much the worse. The O'Connor Don, a Catholic representative in the confidence of, and in open communication with, the Irish Bishops, has before the House at this moment a Bill, in which the requirements of Catholic education are reduced to a minimum. Distinguished members of the Conservative party have given in their names for its support, Liberal statesmen of the foremost rank have declared in its favour, and yet in all human probability the fate of its predecessors is awaiting it. Our theologians make a distinction between the *finis operis* and the *finis operantis*. The *finis operantis*, with those who oppose every form of demand for Catholic education, may be various, but the *finis operis* is clearly one. The scope of the opposition is to ignore individual conscience, and to set up the State conscience as the sole guide and arbitrator in matters religious as in matters secular. This new postulate of the science of Government is pretty generally adopted by the temporal rulers of the day. In Italy the State conscience became uneasy at the possession of so much temporal power and dominion by the Pope, and it thought it obligatory to take them from him. It was not advisable, either, that religious houses should possess property, no matter how legitimately acquired, and accordingly for the benefit of religion all religious goods must be transferred to the public treasury, the owners being graciously permitted to live and starve. The delicacy of the German State conscience is so sensitive, that it has to burthen itself with the care of parochial discipline, diocesan laws, church funds, canonical distributions, religious services, sacred ceremonies, preaching, teaching, &c. The State conscience of France is of a somewhat different type from the others, adopting natural equity as the principle of its action. It deems it unfair that the religious system should receive from Government any particular consideration or support, and therefore to remove all advantage of one side over the other, (this is the reasoning of the advocates of Jules Ferry's Bill), and to give a fair start in the race between religion and secularism, it proposes that henceforward all education shall be secular. Jesus Christ left us a command to hear the Church, and his Apostle teaches us to obey those that are set over us in the Church, as having to render an account to God of our souls, but the despots of modern society leave us no room for the fulfilment of the precept in either form.

This is the revolt of the pride of power; but the pride of

modern intellect rises also in revolt against God and His Church. Amongst the great ones and the wise ones of earth the defection from Christ is so nearly universal that it does not require a strained effort of imagination to suppose Him appealing to us as he did to His Apostles on the memorable occasion at Capharnaum, and asking, "*Et vos vultis abire?*" His co-Apostles left the answering to Peter then, "*Ad quem ibimus Domine? Verba aeternæ vitæ habes,*" We in turn shall do well to make Peter our spokesman and leave the answering to him in this and in all our doubts and uncertainties. The Vatican Council teaches us that "the gift of truth and never failing faith was conferred on Peter and his successors in the Roman See, in order that they might discharge their high office for the salvation of all, that the entire flock of Christ, drawn away by them from the poisonous food of error, might be nourished with the aliment of heavenly doctrine, that the occasions of division being removed, the universal Church might be preserved in unity, and resting on its own foundation might stand firm against the gates of hell." It is in virtue of this prerogative and charge that the successors of Peter not only cannot teach error themselves, but cannot remain silent and passive in the presence of teaching injurious or dangerous to faith or to Christian morals. And hence we have the glorious Pontiff, so recently taken from us, raising up his voice and with no uncertain sound, in a succession of allocutions from November, 1850, to the publication of the Syllabus, against the pernicious modern theories of education. The Pontifical instructions cover the whole ground in dispute, and meet by their wisdom and justice, whilst they confound by their supreme authority, all the attempted inroads of error. They teach us that the theory which asserts "that the entire direction of the public schools, in which the youth of any Christian State is educated, can and ought to be committed to the civil authority, and so fully committed to it, that the right of no other authority should be recognized in the discipline of the schools, in the direction of studies, in the conferring of degrees, in the choice or approbation of the masters," is a theory "invasive of the rights of the Church and gravely detrimental to religion," and the law, constructed on its principles, of October 4th, 1848, is designated a "*funestissima lex*, already producing pernicious fruits by the spreading of pestilential opinions and views opposed to the unchangeable doctrine of the Church."* They denounce the arrogance and expose the short-sightedness of the political philosophy, which proposes as "the most perfect plan of civil

* Allocution of November 1st, 1850, *In consistoriali*.

society, that one which insists that all popular schools open to the children of the various classes of the people, and public institutions destined for the education of youth in letters or in the severer studies, without exception should be exempted from all authority, direction, or interference of the Church, and left completely to the management of the civil and political authority in accordance with Government views, and on the lines of the common opinions of the day."* These and other salutary instructions and admonitions on the state of modern society, which the venerable Pontiff, wise with the wisdom and experience of the Church, did not cease to send forth through his long tenure of Peter's Chair, were received by the Powers to whom they were addressed with unconcealed contempt, and met by the derision of the modern liberal *philosophe*. Current history is, however, giving rapid verification to the words of Pio Nono on at least one subject, the organization of secret societies and the dangers to be apprehended from them, not only to the Church but also to the State, and the thought begins to force itself on the public mind that the wisdom and experience of the Church, reaching farther back into the past than the Statecraft of this century, are indicating for themselves a clearer and more distant range of vision into the future also.

Ad quem ibimus, Domine? Though the others be scandalized in the Vicar of Christ, yet not his brethren in the Episcopate. They rally to him, as true soldiers to their Captain, in the hour of peril. The presence of persecution has elicited for the consolation of the Holy Father the strongest proofs of the fidelity of his brethren and the highest recognition of his infallible magisterium. They remember the double petition in the prayer of Christ for Peter, *Rogavi pro te ut non deficiat fides tua, et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos*, and they appeal from every country of Christendom to the successor of Peter to instruct them how they are to guide their flocks through the labyrinth of false doctrines that surrounds them, and to fortify them out of that strength by which the Church is strong to indefectibility.

The Irish Bishops, to return to the subject of Irish education, as might well be expected from what we have already seen of the state of the question in this country, have been for the last fifty years among the most constant applicants for the instructions and counsel of the Holy See. Ultra-Liberal journalists and other high and sapient political censors, *blasphemantes quæ ignorant*, vilify them unsparingly, and lay at their doors sundry charges of "inconsistency," "illiberality," "irreconcilability" and persistently divided counsels. Nothing could be more unjust. In reality the history of the Irish

* Letter to the Archbishop of Friburg, July 14th, 1864.

Education question as it concerns the Bishops of Ireland is, ever since the year 1830, made up of a series of communications from them to the great teaching centre, setting forth the nature and advantages, or otherwise, of the different proposed schemes ; of prompt and obedient acceptance on their part of the instructions sent back, and of full and faithful promulgations of these to their flocks.

The Irish Education question, with which we are dealing here, commences about the year 1831, two years after the passing of the Emancipation Act. A system of primary education, called the National system, was then introduced. "Its object and fundamental principle" are given in Part I. of "Rules and Regulations of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland," in the following passage :—"The object of the system of national education is to afford *combined* literary and moral, and *separate* religious instruction, to children of all persuasions, as far as possible, in the same school, upon the fundamental principle, that no attempt shall be made to interfere with the peculiar religious tenets of any description of Christian pupils." The proposal had a fair appearance, and it can scarcely be necessary to say that the Irish Catholics, just emerged from the oppression and restrictions of a penal code, joyously and generally availed of it. It gained rapidly on the country and soon came to be not only in name but in effect the national system of education. Its very success engendered alarm in the minds of some amongst the prelates, and it could not be denied that it contained fundamentally elements of possible mischief for Catholicity. The Board, with the approval of the Lord-Lieutenant, could do almost anything they pleased with it. Clauses 4 and 5 of the Rules and Regulations (Part I., par. 1), when looked well into were found to have an alarming significance. "4. The Commissioners will not change any fundamental rule *without the express permission of his Excellency the Lord-Lieutenant.* 5. The Commissioners will not withdraw, or essentially alter any book, that has been, or shall be hereafter, unanimously published or sanctioned by them, *without a previous communication with the Lord-Lieutenant.*" The fixity and continuous moral identity of the system thus rested entirely with the Lord-Lieutenant. The Bishops discussed the matter amongst themselves on several occasions in their yearly synods and finally, in the year 1839, referred the question to the Holy See for solution. A beautiful lesson of prudence and moderation comes to us in the response, which was directed to each of the Irish Metropolitans under date January 16th, 1841.

The importance of the subject involved in the controversy lately arisen in Ireland in reference to the so-called national system for the

education of youth, is, as your Grace well knows, so great, that you cannot wonder that the response of the Sacred Congregation "de Propaganda Fide" has been delayed so long. . . .

It had to consider long and anxiously, as its institute demands, in the question proposed, the security of the Catholic religion, the advantages of education for the young, the duty of making a grateful return to the senate of the British Empire, who had devoted a large amount of money to the support of schools for the Irish people, the necessity of upholding concord amongst Catholic bishops, the obligation of promoting public tranquillity, finally the apprehension that the entire sum of money granted, and the entire management of the system might pass into the hands of heterodox teachers.

All the risks and advantages of the system having been carefully weighed, having heard the arguments on both sides, and particularly having obtained the pleasing information that for the ten years that it has been in operation, the Catholic religion has suffered nothing from the system, the Sacred Congregation, with the approval of our Most Holy Father, Gregory XVI., has concluded that no definite judgment is to be pronounced on the case, and that this kind of education is to be left to the prudent judgment and religious conscience of the bishops, inasmuch as the success of such a system must depend on the vigilant care of the pastors, on the use of various cautionary measures, and finally on the experience which will come with time.

The practical adjustment of the controversy brought satisfaction to the minds of prelates and people, and the national system watched over by the Catholic pastors in accordance with the direction of the Pontiff has been made the instrument of immense temporal benefit to the people, and of some considerable advantage to religion also. There remain still, however, a few flaws in its administration, especially in reference to religious teachers, so unmeaning and illogical, that one wonders how men of the high status of the National Commissioners can allow themselves to be even passively responsible for them.

The next appeal of the Irish Bishops to Rome marks the next move in the matter of education for Ireland. The mixed system, as they wish to call it, having so far succeeded in the schools, it was thought possible and advisable to extend the same to the colleges of an university. Accordingly the scheme of a new university, with three colleges for the three provinces of Munster, Ulster, and Connaught attached to it, under the title of the Queen's University and Queen's Colleges, was devised and soon carried into effect. A greater divergence of opinion than had existed on the national education system then arose amongst the prelates. Some discovered a wide difference between the management of a children's school, in which reading, writing, arithmetic, geography, a little of geometry, and the rudiments of algebra would form the staple of the

education, and the controlling within religious limits of the chairs of history, geology, physiology, and other branches in which infidelity had of late so audaciously interwoven itself with science. Others believed that by a sharp clerical supervision, and the appointment of approved Catholic professors to the dangerous chairs, or at least by a right of veto or protest against recognised infidel candidates, the system of education of the Queen's Colleges might be made practically safe for the faith and morals of the students, and as available for Catholic aspirants to higher education as the national system had proved for the lower. The decision arrived at by the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, and approved by Pius IX., inclined to the former view, and was forwarded to the Irish Bishops on the 9th of October, 1847. It premises that the delay in replying to the questions put by the Irish Bishops arose from the anxiety of the Fathers to examine fully the proofs and documents advanced on either side, and, in a matter so momentous as the question of higher education for the Irish people, to await until they should find themselves secure in the judgment they would pronounce. It then proceeds:—

One thing, however, before all others, we feel bound to declare—that the Sacred Congregation did not for a moment think that the prelates, who appeared to favour the establishment of the colleges, had not a righteous purpose in the part they took; for a long experience has given it ample proof of their sincerity; and it feels convinced that it was the expectation of securing a great benefit, and the belief that they were consulting for the prosperity of religion in Ireland, that induced them to adopt the views they have put forward. Nevertheless, the Sacred Congregation having considered the subject maturely and in all respects, cannot venture to promise itself the favourable results that are contemplated to follow from the establishment of those colleges; it rather apprehends from them grave danger to the Catholic Faith. In a word, it considers an institution of the kind an existing injury to religion. Wherefore it wishes to admonish the archbishops and bishops of Ireland that they are to have no part in the carrying out of it. . . . What has been said should not, however, prevent any of you, who may have something further of graver moment to propose, from frankly submitting it to the Sacred Congregation, in order that the question may, in all its bearings, be duly adjudicated on. The decision of the Congregation was in due course submitted to the Holy Father, who, after having obtained accurate information on the whole question, judged that it was worthy of his approval, and added to it the supreme force of his authority.

The prelates who were in favour of a toleration of the Queen's College scheme, to whose probity and sincerity of purpose the Sacred Congregation bears such strong testimony, did again submit the grounds of their belief, and hoping thereby to calm

in some degree the fears of the Fathers placed before them several statutes, deemed to be of a protective nature for the Catholic students, that had been sanctioned by the Government. Their fears were not removed, for a letter, dated October 11, 1848, is sent forward to the Irish Episcopate, in which, "All things being fully considered, the Sacred Congregation could not, on account of the grave and intrinsic dangers of the said colleges, moderate the decision already given by it, and approved by the Holy Father, and communicated to the four Irish Metropolitans the previous October."

At the Synod of Thurles, held in the summer of 1850, the final attempt to get the question reconsidered by the Congregation, in order to a more modified pronouncement thereon, was made, and without effect; for in the chapter "*de Collegiis Reginæ*" we read as follows:—

Recognising and venerating as we do in the Roman Pontiff the Vicar of Christ on earth, and the Successor of St. Peter, on whom was conferred by God the office of instructing the faithful in sound doctrine, and keeping them away from pestiferous and poisonous pastures, we, with willing mind and all becoming submission, assent to the admonitions and rescripts regarding the Queen's Colleges recently erected amongst us, which rescripts have been confirmed by the authority of the Vicar of Christ, and communicated to us by the Sacred Congregation "*de Propaganda Fide*."

Thenceforward all share in, or sanction or approval of the colleges of the Queen in Ireland, was scrupulously avoided by priests and bishops. The divided counsels were at an end.

Two systems of education, both mixed, both constructed on the same principles, have thus met with very opposite treatment at the hands of the Roman Congregation of Cardinals "*de Fide Propaganda*." To men considering the subject superficially this has the appearance of inconsistency, and the imputations of inconsistency, illiberality, and tyranny are freely made against Rome, and of inconsistency and subserviency against the Irish Episcopate. Leading journals, in the exercise of their infallible censorship, pass sentence of condemnation upon both; and, unfortunately, Catholics, sound at the core, but of faulty vision from the regular study of heterodox literature, follow in their wake. To the disciplined Catholic mind the different solutions given to the two questions do not offer the smallest difficulty. Both were arrived at by the just application of plain and unquestionable theological principles, which, for the better elucidation of the matter, it may be well for us to introduce at this point.

Theologians distinguish between *peccatum* and the *ocasio*

peccati. S. Alphonsus Liguori,* about the middle of the section, says—

The occasion of sinning is not in itself a sin, nor does it involve the necessity of sinning : wherefore there may co-exist with it a real detestation of sin, and a firm purpose of not relapsing and of applying the necessary remedies. The *occasio peccati* is divided into *proxima* and *remota*. Men, as a rule, do not sin from being placed in the *occasio remota*. Men, as a rule, do sin from being placed in the *occasio proxima*.† The *occasio* is again divided into *voluntary* and *necessary*. *Voluntary* is that occasion which can be easily removed ; *necessary* is that, which it is either physically or morally out of our power to remove.

The *occasio* is bad on account of, and in proportion to, the danger of sinning that is involved in it, and this *danger*, when found in the *occasio proxima*, is still subdivided by the same authority, (and we may observe that S. Alphonsus is giving only the ordinary approved teaching of the schools), into *formal* and *material*.

The *formal danger* is that which is so closely connected with sin, that a person in such danger will probably sin or consent to sin. The *material danger* is that which is not closely connected with sin, but only remotely, through the application of the means necessary for the avoidance of sin, and the necessity of the circumstances in which the individual is placed. Hence it will happen in such case that the *occasio* may be of itself *proxima* and the danger only *material*.

Now, this question of mixed education is altogether a question of *occasio peccandi*, proximate or remote, of *periculum peccati*, *formale*, or *materiale*. The individuals to be admitted into the occasion and danger are not capable of taking due care of themselves. They are children in the dawn of reason, and youths just ripening into intelligence, and woe to their pastors if these little ones believing in Him, through their want of vigilance, suffer scandal ! It is their imperative duty to see whether the occasions and dangers of the education to which they are invited can be made remote, and if this can be effected, then the advantages to be derived from the proffered system may be admitted as a reason for its acceptance. But if this cannot be effected, no temporal consideration whatsoever can be allowed to weigh against the exposure to sin of those committed to their charge by God.

In the case of the national system the danger of sin arose, first, from the association of Catholic children with children of other religious beliefs for so many hours every day,

* *Lib. 6. Tract 4 de Pœnitentia, cap. 1, de contritione, Dub. 2, No. 455.*

† *Ibidem, No. 452.*

and in such close companionship as that of schoolmates. (Children, it is well known, are great teachers of one another.) Secondly, from the want of a religious training being incorporated with the work of teaching. The first source of danger was removed by the simple fact that, almost universally, the children of the national schools are exclusively of one religious denomination. The second was obviated by the vigilance of the priests, and, we must in justice add, by the fidelity of the Catholic teachers in imparting religious instruction to their pupils every day during the hour allowed by the Commissioners for the purpose. The Irish Bishops, on the occasions of visitation, find no better instructed children than those brought forward by the teachers of the national schools.

In the students of the Queen's Colleges the dangers to faith and morals increase, whilst the remedial or preventive measures become fewer or less effective. The subjects to be studied, the books to be read, possibly the professors to be attended, bring with them fresh, and for a time increasing, dangers to Catholic young men. The colleges are not numerically denominational, as the national schools have become. The young child with its tender mind, receiving its religious instruction without question or resistance, is a much more manageable disciple than the youth of ripening intelligence, with his curiosity, so often prurient, his tendency to question and to doubt, if he receive any encouragement thereto, and in all probability his self-conceit if he be at all above the average in his studies. Some of these dangers are, it may be said, incidental to all collegiate teaching. Doubtless this is so, but the great object and use of a Catholic collegiate system is to provide against them, to adopt the necessary means to change a proximate occasion of sinning into a remote one, to reduce a formal danger of sin to one that will be merely material. It was for this reason that the Holy See, even so far back as the letter of October, 1847, began to urge the Bishops of Ireland to renewed vigour in the promotion of Catholic collegiate education, and "to the establishment by their united efforts in Ireland of a Catholic Academia, on the principle of that erected by the Prelates of Belgium in Louvain." For this reason the Catholic University of Dublin has been upheld by the bishops, and subsidized by the people of Ireland, for well nigh thirty years, under circumstances of the greatest discouragement and opposition. The unanimous and persevering demand of the Catholics of Ireland for its recognition by the State, a demand, the sincerity of which was substantiated by their liberal and constant contributions for its support, demonstrated its necessity. The character of its staff of professors, unsurpassed by those of any other institution in the

country, in their respective departments, established its fitness, and yet not one of the many projected University Bills for Ireland, not even that of Mr. Gladstone, so mightily vaunted by some, dared to propose to relieve the Catholics of Ireland of the large tax which they have been for so many years levying on themselves for the support of a branch of public education that in equity should be supported by the State. One is reminded, as he considers these things, of the words of St. James: — "And if a brother or sister be naked, and want daily food, and one of you say to them, go in peace, be you warmed and filled, yet give them not those things that are necessary for the body, what shall it profit?"

The present Government, admitting in principle the justice of the Irish Catholic claim for an educational subsidy, or at least the expediency of acceding in some form to Catholic wishes, but, like the past ones, being afraid to undertake the responsibility of the *direct* granting of it, devised the Intermediate Education Act, through the operation of which some assistance might be *indirectly* extended to schools exclusively Catholic. The readiness with which the measure, *manca lex* as it was, was accepted by the Catholic Bishops proved that it was not difficult to satisfy them, and should have served as an earnest to the administration of a similar readiness on their part to accept any reasonable legislation on the University question. It is more than probable that it did serve as such with the leaders of the party in office, and that the University project, which they were dealing with tentatively in the beginning of the present year, was the result thereof. It is a painful position to be associated with clumsy fellow-workmen, in whom one can find no appreciation of his carefully and cunningly conceived design. Lord Beaconsfield seems to have some of the class about him.

The next phase of the Irish University controversy is the Bill of the O'Connor Don, now on trial for its life before the British House of Commons. Its provisions are few and simple and its demands moderate. A glance at its "Constitution" and the "Duties of its Senate" will enable us to understand it sufficiently for the purposes of the present Paper.

3. The said University shall consist—

(a.) Of the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, and Senators hereinafter mentioned.

(b.) Of all persons who shall become matriculated students of the said University, and of all persons upon whom the Senate hereinafter mentioned shall hereafter confer degrees.

4. Immediately after the passing of this Act the Lord-Lieutenant

of Ireland shall appoint a fit and proper person to be the Chancellor of the said University, and another fit and proper person to be the Vice-Chancellor of said University.

5. The persons named in the First Schedule to this Act shall be the first Senators of the University.

6. The said Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor and the other said Senators shall form the first Senate of the University, and shall hold office during the pleasure of the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland. All vacancies in the Senate, except as hereinafter provided, shall be filled up by the Lord-Lieutenant, so that the number of the Senate shall consist of *twenty-four*.

13. It shall be the duty of the Senate to promote University education in Ireland, in the manner provided by this Act; that is to say,

- (b.) For appointing times and places at which examinations shall be held in each year :
- (c.) For defining the qualifications of the persons who may present themselves for examination :
- (d.) For defining the subjects and nature of the examinations and the length of the course necessary for obtaining degrees :
- (e.) For requiring candidates for examination to give such notice as the Senate may prescribe of their intention to present themselves for examination, and for fixing the fees to be paid by candidates upon such notices :
- (f.) For fixing the numbers and amounts of the exhibitions, scholarships, and fellowships which may be awarded in each year, and for declaring the conditions with respect to attendance at college, attendance at the examinations to be held under this Act, and the standard of merit, and conditions with respect to such other matters as the Senate may prescribe, upon compliance with which such exhibitions, scholarships, fellowships, and degrees may be obtained or held :
- (g.) For prescribing and satisfying themselves as to the observance of the conditions upon which heads of colleges may receive payment of result fees and the other advances of money hereinbefore provided for :
- (h.) For making proper provisions to carry out the rules in the schedule to this Act, and for varying, altering, and amending the rules contained in such schedule :
- (i.) Generally for carrying this Act into effect.

The questions called forth by the appearance of the Bill are, first: Do the Irish Bishops accept it? Do they accept it as a final settlement of their demand for University education?

Of their readiness to accept it there is no lack of evidence. That they do not and cannot recognize in it their ideal of an University for Catholics is also evident from their avowed principles and declarations on the subject. But why should the question be raised in reference to this measure in particular?

Is not all new legislation on large and important subjects of necessity experimental and consequently not final?

Secondly: Can the Irish Bishops, without violation of Catholic principle and surrender of the position they had taken up on a former occasion, accept the contemplated legislation?

In the University system are comprehended two functions totally distinct one from the other—the *function of training and teaching*, and the *function of examining*. The first is carried out in the colleges, the second in the University proper. The first they cannot consistently with Catholic principle allow out of their own control and management—hence the condemnation of the Queen's Colleges; if they have secured the first they can hold themselves permissively in regard to the second. In the Bill of the O'Connor Don the function of Catholic training and teaching is admirably secured, and the mixed system completely excluded. This and the indirect sustentation for Catholic teaching which it provides were wanting in the proposal of Mr. Gladstone, two very fundamental points of difference. In very truth the University scheme of the Premier of 1873, had it passed into law, would have been for the Catholic Colleges of Ireland a *damnosa donatio*.

Another branch of mixed education in Ireland, the model schools, bespeaks our attention before concluding this article. The nature of these schools is explained in "Rules and Regulations, Part III., par. 1."

1. District and minor model schools are built and supported entirely out of the funds placed by Parliament at the disposal of the Commissioners, and are therefore under their exclusive control.

2. The chief objects of the model schools are to promote united education; to exhibit the most approved methods of literary and scientific instruction to the surrounding schools, and to train young persons for the office of teacher.

3. In district and minor model schools the Commissioners appoint and dismiss, of their own authority, the teachers and other officers; regulate the course of instruction, and exercise all the rights of patrons.

The conditions and circumstances on account of which the Holy See tolerated, and the Irish Bishops accepted, the ordinary national schools are all absent here. The schools seemed to be framed as if with the express design of excluding them. From the educational advantages they hold out they will always, except in the very rare instance, of there being no Protestants, in the place, be frequented by Protestant children, and, should Catholic children be allowed to use them, will consequently be always practically mixed schools. The fact that the ordinary national schools are practically unmixed or deno-

minational schools, is the circumstance that keeps them in favour with the Catholic Prelates. Next, the prevalence of Catholic managership of schools in Catholic districts, with the vigilance over Catholic interests to be expected from it, is the principal means of allaying fears on a very obvious source of apprehension. In the model school scheme Catholic managership is completely set aside. Again, the Holy See suggested to the bishops, and the bishops sharply appreciated, the wisdom of keeping in their own hands the ownership of the schools frequented by Catholic children against the possible contingency of disagreement between the Episcopate and the Commissioners. Ownership in the model schools is reserved to the Commissioners themselves. When we add to all this that in the model schools the Commissioners "have exclusive control," that "they regulate the course of studies and exercise all the rights of patrons," we have said *satis superque* to show that model schools and Queen's Colleges have been justly regarded by the Sacred Congregation and dealt with by the Irish Episcopate as included in one and the same category. Bishop or priest can have no part in either. Bishops and priests are bound to admonish their flocks that in both grave and intrinsic dangers to faith and morals exist.

The latest pronouncement of Rome on mixed teaching is contained in an "Instruction of the Holy Office of January 17th, 1866, on Mixed Schools," with an extract or two from which the present Paper may be brought to a close. To the question proposed, "Whether it is lawful for parents to send their children for instruction to schools of this kind,"—the Most Eminent Fathers of the Congregation reply, "That it is to be most urgently impressed on all fathers of families that they can in no other way deserve worse of their offspring, of their country, or of the Catholic cause, than by exposing their children to this extreme risk." They then expatiate at length on the various dangers arising for Catholic children in mixed places of instruction, and afterwards lay down the conditions on which parents may be permitted to avail themselves of the system, at the same time peremptorily requiring that the said conditions be clearly and unmistakably present.

It is not, however, overlooked by the most eminent Fathers that certain peculiar combinations of affairs may bring about a necessity of sometimes regulating these schools, as, for instance, when Catholics are so oppressed that they have neither the way nor the means of getting at, or of having schools of their own, and are thus placed in the alternative of relinquishing altogether the educational subsidies necessary for their families, and leaving the entire management of public matters to the heterodox party, or submitting, no matter how unwillingly, to the system of the mixed schools. But although the Fathers, moved by this

consideration, are of opinion that access to mixed schools is not to be absolutely and unconditionally condemned, but that the case is to be left to the prudent judgment and religious conscience of the individual bishops, nevertheless, lest any person should deceive himself in a matter of so much importance, they wish to invite serious attention to two admonitions, the same that are given by all theologians when there is question of the *proximate, necessary occasion* of sin, first, that the bishops satisfy themselves that the alleged necessity is not a pretended, but a real necessity; secondly, that those whose duty it is, carefully apply all the means that may be efficacious in averting the danger of perversion.

HENRY F. NEVILLE.

ART. VII.—THE EDUCATION QUESTION IN BELGIUM.

THE so-called Liberal Ministry whom the last elections, contrary to all expectation, raised to power in Belgium, has submitted to the Legislative Chambers a Bill on Primary Education—that is to say, on the education of the people—which is causing the liveliest excitement throughout the country. Under the specious pretext of preserving neutrality among all forms of religion, so as not to trench on freedom of conscience, this treacherous bill excludes from the programme of studies the sole true and solid basis of all good education—viz., religion. Schools without religion will produce only an atheistic generation, without principles and without morals. The bishops have, in two collective Pastoral letters, strongly protested against this mad attempt to un-Christianize Belgium. Whatever the newspapers devoted to the Ministry may say, this Bill deeply wounds the feelings of the nation. A vast petition to the Legislative Chambers demonstrates that in the country parts nearly all fathers of families, and in the towns the majority of them, abhor the proposed law, and regard it as an attack on their rights as fathers and their faith as Christians.

The Ministry, nevertheless, pushed on by the Masonic lodges, who are atheists in this country, persists in the desire to enforce their fatal Bill. We are threatened shortly with the spectacle of the revival of the ill-omened days which preceded 1830. The happy union which makes both our motto and our strength,* and which we gained at the cost of so many sacrifices, is on the point of being broken. Instead of celebrating next year in unity and joy the fiftieth anniversary of our emancipation and national existence, the nation, divided and torn, will celebrate it in strife

* The Belgian motto is, "L'Union fait la Force."

and mourning, unless the Senate, placing the salvation of the people above political passion, oppose an obstacle to the devastating torrent. Belgium, hitherto so happy, will see her children divided one against another by the imposition of a law which has been provoked by no abuse and which nothing can justify. For the motive of the proposed law is neither the need of amending existing laws nor the necessity of redressing abuses; but solely the wish to please the Masonic lodges and to satisfy certain freethinkers among the Deputies, who claim freedom of conscience for those only who have no conscience. It matters little to them that Catholics, Protestants, and Jews should be free to exercise their religion; they themselves must be free to have none, and to exclude Divine Providence from the government of the world.*

Before explaining the new Bill and the position in which it will place Catholics, we must cast a glance backwards to see what has been the condition and progress of education in Belgium since 1830.

The usurpations of the Government of the Low Countries in the domain of public instruction, the annoying measures introduced into the common schools, the establishment of a philosophical college at Louvain, imposed on Catholics against their faith—all these vexations were undoubtedly among the chief causes of the revolution of 1830. One of the first cares, therefore, of the National Congress was to inscribe on the charter of our political rights Freedom of Instruction—in order to prevent the return of similar abuses. Article 17 of the Constitution declares: "*Teaching is free*; every preventive measure is forbidden; the repression of offences is regulated by the law. Public instruction given at the cost of the State is equally regulated by law."

It follows from this that instruction in all its grades is completely free. *Primary* instruction, which is given in schools to the children of the people; *secondary* instruction, which forms youth to the study of the *belles lettres* in the *athénées*, colleges, and junior seminaries (*petits séminaires*); *superior* instruction, which prepares young men from the colleges for the liberal careers by the study of philosophy, law, the sciences, and medicine, in the four Universities of Brussels, Ghent, Liège, and Louvain; *theological* instruction, which forms priests, in the

* Our Liberals have gone as far as this. M. Frère, their leader, in order not to offend the liberty of conscience of Citizen Janson, Socialist advocate, Member for Brussels, consented that the mention of Divine Providence should be withdrawn from the Speech to the Throne at the opening of the Legislative Session in November last. What conscience can a man have who denies the existence of God?

senior seminaries (*grands séminaires*), in religious houses, and at the University of Louvain; all these different grades of teaching are equally free, whether given by the State or by individuals.

No hindrance can be offered to it: no preventive measure can strike it. Every corporation, every private person can erect, open, and conduct establishments of instruction without the Government being able, under any pretext, to oppose the enterprise. The civil power cannot meddle in private instruction under pretext of surveillance or of abuse: it has no right except to check offences.

The State enjoys rights equally with individuals: it can establish, at its own cost, institutes of public instruction. It has made use of this right in creating the Universities of Ghent and Liège for superior instruction, and in establishing ten royal *athénées* and various colleges for teaching the humanities. Further on we shall see what it has done for primary education. As the learned Professor Thonissen has well noted in his remarkable work on the Belgian Constitution,* in certain circumstances it may be necessary that the Government should establish schools to supply for the insufficiency of private ones. Where they are not a necessity such schools may be useful by the competition which they provoke. Free competition stimulates personal interest, introduces variety and the comparison of methods, develops the sciences, rouses emulation under all its forms, and so furnishes the elements of a real and durable progress. But, on the other hand, it is certain that the State runs counter to the wish of the National Congress and mistakes its constitutional mission if it draws lavishly from the coffers of the State treasury for unnecessary establishments, and renders the competition of free education impossible. The Congress did not intend this: the article before quoted says so plainly, and the discussions which preceded are a proof of it.† In reality, would it not be a mere sham to proclaim education free, and to take away from individuals all possibility of competing with the State? Besides, the mission of the State is not to substitute itself for its citizens, not to concentrate in its own hands all their

* *La Constitution Belge annotée*, p. 64. Bruxelles, 1876.

† When, in 1835, the first Law on Universities was discussed, the Central Section, composed of the old Members of the National Congress, said:—"The Central Section rejects the principle which gives the mission of teaching to the State, because the liberty of instruction proclaimed by the Constitution, instead of being the rule, will be no more than a feeble accessory which Governmental action will soon absorb. The Central Section thinks that if Government action in public education exist at all, it should only be to *fill up the blank* which may be left by liberty—too young as yet to have had time to reconstruct everything."

rights, their personal duties, their activity, but solely to help, to protect the work of their intellectual, physical, and moral progress. It must not, therefore, offer a ruinous opposition to private initiative. Yet it is this which the Government seems to wish to do at present for the primary schools, as we shall see further on.

As soon as the Constitution had been voted and peace re-established, the Catholics hastened to avail themselves of the liberty which had been granted them by our fundamental pact, by erecting establishments of instruction in all its branches. *Petits séminaires* were organized by the bishops in all the dioceses for the teaching of the humanities to the young levites, and to others whom their parents wished to confide to them. Besides these smaller seminaries a certain number of episcopal colleges were erected, according to need and means.

The Jesuit Fathers joined their efforts to those of the secular clergy and established large and fine colleges in which almost the whole of the Belgian nobility is formed to the study of *belles lettres* during the six or seven years of the humanity course. We can now count in Belgium ten *petits séminaires*, twenty-two episcopal colleges, eleven colleges directed by the Jesuits, and three by the Josephites, besides institutes for commerce, the so-called middle schools, and the boarding-schools where the classics are not taught. All these establishments are completely organized, enjoy the confidence of parents, and so successfully compete with the *athénées*, colleges, and other Government and town schools, that the educational establishments of the clergy train in humanities more than three-quarters of the youth of Belgium.

The Law of 1850 organized, under the name of "middle education," the teaching of *athénées*, colleges, and schools called "middle," erected by the State and the Communes. The Episcopal Colleges, directed by secular priests but adopted and subsidized by the Communes and provinces, are subject to the same law. The other ecclesiastical establishments—colleges, *petits séminaires* or boarding schools, arrange their programme of studies in full liberty. It is to be remarked that the establishments of the clergy do not enjoy what we call civil "personality." They are private property; the law does not otherwise recognize them. Gifts made to them directly are reputed legally null. The judges, in cases which have arisen on the subject, have shown themselves severe to a degree which the English would consider contrary to equity.

In all the establishments, both of the clergy and of the State, the humanity studies occupy six years. Scholars whose early instruction is not sufficiently developed make a preparatory year called the *septième*. It is not necessary to remark that religion

forms the basis of all instruction and education in the establishments of the clergy. Those of the Government are, in this respect, very deficient, and it is this which enfeebles them and takes away confidence in them. Nevertheless, the law of 1850 sets down religious teaching in the programme of studies. The greater part of the colleges and *athénées* have adopted the "Convention of Antwerp," entered into, in 1852, by the Cardinal of Mechlin and the Government, in virtue of which a Catholic priest is attached to each college to give religious instruction. "Dissenters" (*Les dissidents*) are dispensed from attendance at these instructions. Recently, some large towns, directed by the Masonic lodges, have suppressed the course of religion and sent away the priest.

At the same time that they organized colleges and schools of every kind, the bishops bethought themselves also of profiting by the liberty granted, to found a house of superior instruction. In 1834 they erected, with the authorization of Pope Gregory XVI., the University of Louvain, comprising five faculties: theology, law, medicine, letters, and science. There have since been added a normal school of humanities for the clergy, special schools of engineering, and a school of agriculture.

On the other side, the Masonic lodges have profited by the 17th Article of the Constitution, to erect a Free University at Brussels, intended to combat Catholic doctrines and to oppose the University of Louvain. The State, on its side, has organized two Universities, one at Ghent, the other at Liège.

The beginnings of the Universities of Louvain were modest; it grew speedily, and by its discipline, by the solidity of its studies, and the reputation of its professors, it gained the confidence of parents, to such a degree, that at the present day it counts 1350 students—as many as the two State Universities together, and twice as many as the Free University of Brussels, in spite of the fact that this last is placed in the Capital with its large population. The notorious impiety of some of the professors of the State Universities has contributed not a little to bring discredit on their teaching.

The Law of the 20th May, 1876, regulated the granting of Academic Degrees. Each university has the power of subjecting its pupils to examinations, conformably to a programme fixed by the law, and of conferring Academic Degrees. There is a "central jury" before which all students, without distinction, may present themselves to be examined and to obtain degrees. Degrees, in order to have legal effect, must be "ratified" by a Special Commission named by the Government, which inquires whether the diplomas have been granted regularly after due examination and on the conditions required by the law.

The education of Girls could not escape the solicitude of the Church, which has reinstated woman, and which appreciates the important rôle which she fills in the family. Excellent boarding schools have been erected in the towns and their suburbs by the numerous teaching religious communities in Belgium. Young women there receive a careful education, and are formed to the knowledge and the virtues proper to their sex. The higher education of these young people may be said to be entirely in the hands of Religious : for there is only an insignificant number of lay institutions occupied with it, and those only in the large towns.

At all times, and among all peoples, the Catholic Church has watched with jealous care over the education of young children. On the training of children often depends both their later life and their eternal salvation. The Church has always required that religion should be the basis of all education, but particularly of the education of the young.

An education,* writes Pius IX.,* which is not only occupied with nothing but the science of natural things and the ends of earthly society, but which, still more, withdraws itself from the truths revealed by God, inevitably falls under the yoke of the spirit of error and falsehood, and an education which pretends to form the minds and hearts of young people of a nature so tender and susceptible of being turned to evil, and to form them without the aid of Christian doctrine and morality, must of necessity produce a race delivered over without bridle to bad passions and to the pride of reason ; and the generations thus brought up cannot but prepare for the family and the State the greatest calamities.

But if this detestable method of education, separated from the Catholic faith and from the power of the Church, is a source of evils for individuals and for society, when there is question of the training in letters and science of the higher classes of society, in public schools, who cannot see that the same method will produce still more deadly results when it is applied to elementary schools. It is chiefly in these schools that the children of the people of all conditions ought from their tenderest years to be carefully instructed in the mysteries and the precepts of our holy religion, and diligently formed to piety, to moral integrity, to religion, and honesty of life. In these schools religious doctrine ought to have the first place in everything which concerns either instruction or training.

That religion ought to be the foundation of education is indicated by common sense, and has been admitted by the most distinguished politicians of France, Germany, and England. Teaching based on religion is the first means of civilization ; it has made Europe what it now is. Without religion, teaching

* Letter of Pius IX. to the Archbishop of Freiburg, 14th July, 1864.

easily becomes a danger. Those who imagine that to render men virtuous and honest it suffices to dissipate their ignorance, are singularly in error. And they will soon be persuaded of their error if they will study the statistics of prisons:

A Protestant, M. Guizot, said to the Chamber of Deputies in 1833—

It is necessary that the general atmosphere of a school be religious; education is here our concern rather than instruction. Religious instruction mixes with the whole body of instruction, with all the acts of the master and of the children. . . . Gentlemen, remember a fact which has perhaps never shone out so evidently as in our own time: intellectual development when united with moral and religious development is excellent; but intellectual development alone, separated from moral and religious, becomes the source of pride, insubordination, egoism, and by consequence of danger to society.

M. Cousin defended the same thesis in the Report addressed to M. de Montalivet, Minister of Public Instruction in France—

Education must be moral and religious if it is desired to make it useful to the people and to society; this point touches on the dearest interests of humanity. It would be absurd to wish to give *moral and religious instruction* in schools without introducing *the clergy* into them. You, Sir, thanks be to God, are too enlightened, too much a statesman, to fancy that we can have true popular instruction without morality, or popular morality without religion, or religion without a form of worship. Christianity must be the basis of the people's education, we should never shrink from avoiding this doctrine; to do so is as politic as it is honest. I write to you from Berlin, and not from Rome. And he who speaks to you is a philosopher who has been before now misunderstood and even persecuted by the clergy.

Jouffroy added to this: "Without religion no moral education is possible." Our statesmen appeal to France; but they forget what M. Ernoul, Chairman of the Committee on Primary Instruction, said in 1872—

Ought education to be religious? Even to propose the question seriously would be to despair of our civilization and of the future of our country. Instruction cannot be separated from education, nor can there be education without morals and religion. Instruction is a power and an instrument which must be entrusted to honest hands, a light which ought to direct the soul of the child and incline it towards the eternal source of the good, the true, and the beautiful.

Need we add the testimony of an Emperor, venerable for age, power, and success on the battle-field? Showing his arm, wounded by German Socialism, to the first Magistrates of his Capital, the Emperor William said: "Secure to your children a religious education: it is the price of security." I will say nothing of English statesmen; the readers of the DUBLIN REVIEW know

their sentiments. Its April number contained an article devoted to the Law on Elementary Instruction.

The Belgian clergy—like all the men of 1830—profoundly imbued with these ideas, turned its attention from the First to the Primary Schools. In 1830, after the vexations of the Government of Holland, popular instruction was in a very sad condition. Many places had no school; the buildings were insufficient and unwholesome; besides, the teachers were neither sufficiently capable nor sufficiently trained; and the schools were badly attended. The clergy set themselves to work: they built and opened schools on all sides. The Christian Brothers and other congregations of men and women were formed for the purpose of devoting themselves to teaching and education. But private initiative was not sufficient for all educational wants. The State intervened, according to the spirit of the Constitution, not to destroy, as is the desire at present, but to second private efforts and to give a greater impulse to the teaching of youth. The Communes adopted the schools of the Brothers and Religious, the Government came in with subsidies. Some years later the Government thought it opportune to give a still more active impulse. This led to that wise Law of 1842, which—thanks chiefly to the efforts of the clergy—has rendered primary education so flourishing in Belgium; a law carried almost unanimously in both the Legislative Chambers; a law praised by King Leopold I., himself a Protestant; a law against which no religious confession has ever appealed; a law which has been maintained by all the Ministers, Liberals as well as Catholics, who have succeeded each other from 1842 to the present day; a law, finally, which merited such high eulogium for the Belgian Government, last year, at the Paris Exhibition. This is the law which the Ministry who at this moment govern us wish to abolish, in order to please a few freethinkers, full of contempt for the people, who force their own wishes on the Government.* To this end they do not fear to sacrifice the desires of five millions of Catholics to the caprices of twenty thousand free thinkers, and to tear to pieces the Union of 1830 at the moment of celebrating its fiftieth anniversary.

Education is one of those many-sided matters which in canonical language are called *mixed*; it concerns, at the same time,

* M. Laurent, professor at the University of Ghent, one of the strong minds of the party, in the April number of the *Revue de Belgique*, is not content to accuse the manufacturing classes of profound ignorance and to menace them with compulsory teaching; he styles them "*sauvages*," "*barbares*," "*canaille*." This is Voltaire over again. "The people," said that great enemy of religion, "is nothing but a herd of oxen for which you need a yoke, a goad, and hay."

the spiritual and the civil order, the Church and the State. The Church—because it is an instrument for the salvation of souls: the State—because it is an element in temporal prosperity and in human progress. Instruction, given as it ought to be, is the grand means of civilization; just as it becomes the source of the greatest evils when perverted.

In modern societies where freedom of conscience and worship exists, the education question is one of the most complex, and the most difficult of solution. For the point is to determine what portion of authority belongs to each power. In theory, this division of rights may not appear very difficult; in practice, education cannot proceed without clashing, unless there is an understanding between Church and State—an understanding easy enough in itself to come to, but which political passions and the efforts of irreligion incessantly tend to frustrate. The Law of 1842 resolved, for Belgium, this difficult problem to the common advantage of the two powers. The principal provisions of this law are as follows:—In each commune in the kingdom there is to be at least one primary school, established in a convenient place; but in case of necessity, two or more neighbouring communes may be authorized to join together in founding or supporting a school. When the requirements of primary education are sufficiently provided for in any locality by private schools, the commune may be dispensed from establishing a school itself. The commune can be authorized to adopt, in the same locality, one or more private schools, which accept the legal conditions required in a communal school. The commune is bound to find gratuitous instruction for all poor children whose parents apply for it, whether in a communal school or in that which holds its place, or in some other school specially designated by it for that effect.

Thanks to the united efforts of the Government and the clergy, there is at present scarcely a commune which has not its school, either communal or *adopted*. All communes where the population is sufficiently numerous have separate schools for the two sexes. The following, according to the last Triennial Report, was the number of Primary Schools in Belgium in 1875:—

The number of Primary Schools of every description ("Communal," "Adopted," "Private, subject to inspection," "Private, entirely free," "Primary boarding-schools") was 5857. Of this number, 4661 schools were subject to inspection, and consequently organized conformably to the law of 1842, and 1196 entirely free. The free schools, equally with the "adopted" schools, are all the creation of Catholic charity. There are no exceptions save only one small school erected at Brussels by a Freethought Society, called "*Ligue de l'enseignement*," and four Sectarian Schools for "Dissenters" (Anglicans, Protestants,

Jews). The number of schools is divided thus: 2127 schools for girls, 1766 for boys; 1904 mixed for both sexes; 457 schools are "adopted;" 958 private schools are entirely free, depending on the Government neither for the nomination of teachers nor for support, nor in their interior discipline; 270 Primary boarding-schools, 32 of which are subject to inspection and 238 entirely free. The teaching staff for these various schools amounted in 1875 to 11,863 masters and mistresses, lay and religious. Of this number 5778 are legally certificated, and of these 5524 are attached to Communal Schools.

The inspectors of the Flemish provinces report a great dearth of certificated masters in those parts. The scarcity will doubtless become infinitely greater if the new Bill is voted into law. On the contrary, there continues to be a superabundance of candidate teachers, and particularly of certificated mistresses, in the Walloon provinces. It is in evidence that, in the month of July, 1875, there were vacancies for 155 masters and mistresses in the Primary Communal Schools of the Flemish provinces, in consequence of the want of candidates with the necessary testimonials of capacity. The default was chiefly in assistant masters (*sous-instituteurs*).

The Law of 14th August, 1873, authorized a special loan of twenty millions of francs (800,000*l.*) for the building and furnishing of school houses. This gave a great impetus to school building. We may even say that in more than one case too much money was spent. The number of children frequenting Primary Schools had risen, in December, 1875, to 669,192, in a population (in Belgium) of 5,403,006 inhabitants. To this number must be added children who receive instruction at home, in apprenticeship, &c. So that there are scarcely any children who do not receive primary instruction.

Besides Primary Schools, there were in December, 1875, 929 *gardiennes* schools for children under six or seven years of age. In these schools there were nearly a hundred thousand children. Schools for *adults*, at the same date, numbered 2615, of which 1623 were communal, and 992 private. The pupils of these latter far exceed in number those of the communal schools. The *gardiennes* and adult schools are not regulated by the Law of 1842—they scarcely existed at that epoch; they are subject to later regulations drawn up in the same spirit. The total expenditure for primary education, which in 1843 did not exceed 2,651,639 francs, had risen, in 1875, to the sum of 24,806,428 francs—an increase of twenty-two millions of francs.*

* All these details are taken from the last Triennial Report on the State of Primary Education in Belgium, presented to the Legislative Chambers by M. Delcour, Minister of the Interior. Brussels, 1877.

To return to the Law of 1842. It regulates teaching as follows :—

Primary instruction *necessarily* includes the teaching of *religion and morals*, reading, writing, the legal system of weights and measures, the elements of arithmetic, and (according to the needs of the locality) the elements of the French, Flemish, or German languages. The religious and moral teaching is given under the direction of the ministers of the religion professed by the majority of the scholars in a school. Children not belonging to the religious communion of the majority are dispensed from attendance at religious teaching. It is to be remarked that in the country districts, except in four communes of Corinage, all the scholars belong to the Catholic religion. In the large towns, there are Communal Schools for "Dissenters."

The supervision of schools, as to instruction and administration, is exercised by communal authority and by inspectors. As regards religious and moral teaching, the supervision belongs to the ministers of religion. The books intended for primary instruction are approved by the Government, except books exclusively used for religious instruction, which are approved by the religious authorities only. Reading books used for primary and religious instruction at the same time are submitted for the approbation of both the Government and religious superiors.

In order to justify the new Bill which excludes religion from the programme of studies, it has been pretended that the Law of 1842 created *neutral* and not *creed* schools. This is a manifest error. The provisions which we have just sketched prove it to demonstration, but as the pretence is insisted on, we will make the point still clearer.

The programme of studies includes religion as of necessity, and religion here is not vague doctrine without exact dogma; not indeterminate, universal, independent morality, variable at pleasure, according to the caprice of reason; it is a positive doctrine, a determinate worship, the worship of the majority of the scholars—that is to say, Catholic worship, for all schools except a few where the majority is Protestant. Only, it is added—as it ought to be in a country of freedom of conscience—that the "dissentients" are dispensed from assisting at such religious teaching. Article 6 says this formally. Its exact words are—

Primary instruction includes, necessarily, religious and moral teaching. . . . The religious and moral teaching is given under the direction of the ministers of the worship which the majority of scholars in the school profess. Children who do not belong to the religious communion of the majority in the school shall be dispensed from assisting at this teaching.

These words would appear to need no comment. But as our adversaries insist, we add—

The principal author of the Law, M. T. B. Nothoms, Minister of the Interior at that time, and Member of the National Congress, expressed himself as follows on Article 6 :—

No primary education without moral and religious education. And we understand by religious education the teaching of a positive religion. *We are all agreed on this principle.* It is our point of departure. We break—and we must say it, and say it aloud—we break with the political doctrines of the eighteenth century which pretended to completely secularize education, and to constitute society on bases purely rationalistic. . . . By whom shall religion be taught? It can only be by the ministers of religion or under their direction; they alone are competent in such an affair; the civil authority left to itself would be competent only for primary instruction strictly so called, if, indeed, primary instruction could be isolated. We are in this way led to invoke the intervention of the clergy. Elsewhere the civil authority may show itself distrustful; inscribe on your banners *le prêtre hors des affaires*; but here you are forced to have recourse to the priest; you have need of him; primary education as to religion is essentially his affair.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Bill, M. A. Dechamps, the brother of our present Cardinal, is not less categorical :—

The *public* school, founded at the expense of the ratepayers, to be constitutional must not be hostile to the feelings of the populations themselves. Now we know of both Protestant localities and Jewish localities, but we do not know of rationalistic or atheistic localities. The school which should leave out religious teaching would evidently be a rationalistic school, and the State which founded such a school would offend liberty of conscience and liberty of worship. . . . Rationalistic schools may exist without doubt, but they will be private schools supported by those who are willing to send their children to such teachers. Liberty of education exists; such persons may avail themselves of it. But they may not go so far as to pretend that the Commune, the Province, or the Government, can create at the expense of the majority an education which wounds all religions at once.

The most authoritative voices among the Liberals say the same thing. "We are *all agreed* on this point," said M. Dolez. And M. Lebeau adds—"I do not hesitate to reply that I shall regard an *anti-religious primary teacher as a pest*."*

What we have just said abundantly suffices to demonstrate the religious (*confessional*) character of the law of 1842. But since M. Rolin, the Minister of the Interior, has officially

* See other testimonies in a *brochure*, "Réponse à la Circulaire Ministérielle du 8 Mars, 1879." Authentic Documents published under the auspices of Card. Dechamps. Mechlin, Dessain, 1879.

announced the contrary in all the communes of Belgium, and sent a circular to all electors, in which the Government speaks to the same effect, and strives to prove that there has been, for thirty-seven years, universal misconception of the character of this law, we would rather give a superabundance of proofs.

For the carrying out of Article VI. of the Law of 1842, M. le Comte de Theux, then Minister of the Interior, published on the 16th August, 1846, a Regulation sanctioned by the King, in which we read:—"Art. 14. The religious and moral lessons, in schools where the majority of scholars profess the Catholic religion, are to be given during the first half-hour in the morning, and in the evening during the last half-hour of the classes. Art. 15. Classes are to commence and end with prayer said in common. Art. 16. Moral and religious teaching shall be earnestly attended to. The teacher shall make it the object of his assiduous care. He will zealously make use of occasions which present themselves unceasingly for developing religious and moral principles. Art. 17. The Catholic teacher will follow, for these three Articles, the direction emanating from the Bishops, in virtue of Art. 6 of the Law. Art. 18. Teachers shall conform themselves as to the method to be employed in religious and moral teaching, to the instructions addressed by the Bishops of Belgium to their clergy, a copy of which is annexed hereto." In these instructions we read:—

Art. 1. Religious and moral teaching include three parts: the ordinary prayers of a Christian, the abridgment of Christian Doctrine contained in the Catechism of the diocese, and Sacred History both of the Old and the New Testament. Art. 5. It is very important that, besides this, the teacher should avail himself of the ordinary reading lessons, to prepare the child for understanding the text of the Catechism and Sacred History. Art. 11. The teacher shall make it a duty to inculcate to his scholars an inviolable attachment to the institutions of the country, an entire devotion to the public good, and a sincere love for the august dynasty which governs us. Art. 21. He will have a care to give to his school a religious appearance (*une physionomie religieuse*) which will exercise a salutary influence over the hearts of the children, and will powerfully help the master to work out their education. To this end he will place in the most conspicuous place in the school, where the children can see them, a Crucifix and an image of the Blessed Virgin.

We find the same spirit in the regulations of the Law of 1842, which concern the inspection of schools, and the training of teachers in the Normal Schools. This remains to be shown, in order to make the Law known in its entirety.

The nomination of Communal teachers is made by the Communal Council from among the candidates who show that they

have followed profitably, during at least two years, the courses at one of the State Normal Schools,* or the courses of a private Normal School which has been for at least two years under inspection. The number of Normal establishments for the training of primary masters and mistresses was thirty-eight in 1875. Since then the number has been augmented by one Normal School for masters at Bruges, and another at Mons, and by several private Normal Schools accepted by the Government. There were, in 1875, for the training of masters, two State Normal Schools, both directed by priests of known capacity, whom our new Minister of Public Instruction churlishly dismissed on the 1st of January last, without being able to excuse his violent and unjust act by any complaint. There were, besides, five Normal sections annexed to Middle Schools, and eight Normal Schools accepted. Two of these "accepted" Normal Schools have been founded and directed by the Christian Brothers; five belong to the secular clergy; one—that of Brussels—erected in 1874, was confided to lay persons, and does not offer the guarantees which are to be found up to the present in the State Normal Schools and in those of the clergy.

The Law of 1842 requires that there shall be in all Normal Schools a minister of religion,† whose office it is to teach morality and religion. This ordinance remains in force until the application of the new law with which we are threatened.

There were, for the training of female teachers, in 1875, one State Normal School in Liège, inaugurated the same year, and twenty-two Normal Schools adopted by the State, nearly all erected and governed by religious women, and subject to the Law of 1842.

The course of studies in all these Normal Schools lasts three years, and the programme of studies is so comprehensive that it exceeds the mental powers of students who possess only moderate abilities. The State grants burses, and exemption from military service, to students of the Normal Schools, on condition that they engage to serve the Government as teachers for five years. This is a point which the Bishops will doubtless take into account in the practical measures which their zeal and prudence will dictate to them in opposition to the new law.

* With the Normal Schools are classed the Superior Primary Schools, and the Middle Schools founded and supported by the Government with the help of the Communes, where the Normal "courses" have been adopted in such schools. There may be a Superior Primary School for each official *arrondissement*. In default of certificated teachers, the Communes are authorized to choose fit subjects under certain conditions.

† Up to the present time there are none but ministers of the Catholic religion.

The number of Government certificates granted in the various Primary Normal Schools, from the date of their institution to the 31st of December, 1875, amounts to 5868 for masters, and to 3000 for mistresses. The greater number of these certificates belong to clerical establishments. Certificates awarded by clerical establishments cost the State very little money, whilst the State Schools demand heavy budgets. For example, a master's certificate at Malonne (a clerical establishment) costs 512f., whilst at Nivelles (a State training-school) it costs 2117f. Yet these are the establishments which the proposed Law blots out with a stroke of the pen, although no abuse, no grievance, has afforded a pretence for it—unless it be the hatred which our new Statesmen have sworn against the clergy and their establishments.*

The expenses of primary education are defrayed by the Communes. The Province and the State give aid if there be occasion—which is nearly always the case with Communal Schools—by awarding grants.† Poor children receive gratuitous education. The Communal authorities exercise supervision over these schools with respect to teaching and administration. As to the teaching of religion and morality, supervision is exercised by delegates of the religious authorities. Ministers of religion and the said delegates have the right to inspect the school any time they please. The Law appoints cantonal and provincial Civil Inspectors to visit the schools. Ecclesiastical Inspectors have the right of assisting at the quarterly conferences of the teachers assembled under the presidency of the provincial or cantonal Inspector, and to preside over these meetings in matters appertaining to moral and religious education. The Bishops are represented on the Central Commission of Primary Instruction by the Diocesan Inspectors. The Consistories of other religious bodies can likewise depute their delegates.

Such are the principal provisions of the Law which has regulated Primary Education in Belgium since 1842 to the present time, and which, thanks to the good understanding that has existed between Church and State, has made it so flourishing. From what we have explained, it is clearly deduced, that the Law of 1842 comprises in its programme of studies *morality and religion*, and that it leaves their direction and supervision to the ministers of religion exclusively, and, consequently, that the schools it creates are not godless and undenominational, but denominational (*confessionnelles*). We have reason to be astonished that a Minister of

* To form a comparison between the Normal Schools of the State and those of the clergy, see the speech of M. Van Hoorde in the Chamber of Representatives, the 2nd of last May.

† No school can receive a grant unless it submits to inspection.

the Crown should have presumed to call into question a truth so evident.*

The Law, which gave satisfaction to all parties, and led to such a happy understanding between the State and the Church, was not long in producing abundant fruits. The enemy of all good could not behold without envy a condition so prosperous. As far back as 1846 he sought to disturb it. A Liberal Congress met at Brussels, and the present Prime Minister, M. Frère, persuaded it to adopt a programme for the abrogation of the Law of 1842, and the abolition of the priest's right to enter the schools. The Liberals of those days did not dare openly to show hostility towards the Catholic religion. It was necessary for them to dissemble their designs in order to impose upon the masses. M. Defaiqz, Grandmaster of the Freemasons, opened the Liberal Congress by the declaration that the Congress "desired to render to religion the respect which is due to it." They affected to have to do "only with the encroachments of the clergy, and clerical pretensions." This has been their cry ever since. By this cry they seduce the people at every election. The newspapers, which daily drag priests and religions through the mud, change their language completely when the time for the elections draws near. Then they profess respect for the clergy; they wish only to reform abuses; they "venerate the religion of our fathers." To listen to them, one would think that religion has no stauncher supporters than themselves; they desire to render it more pure by cleansing it of its dross, to make the ministrations of the priests more fruitful, by relieving them of temporal cares. It was by these artifices they succeeded once more deceiving the electors at the last election. In reality, they aim at the apostasy of Belgium. They want compulsory, gratuitous, and atheistic education in order to destroy Christianity; but they dare not say so openly. It is in the dark shades of a Masonic lodge when haranguing the initiated in secret, far from ears profane, that they betray their true sentiments, and exclaim, "A corpse oppresses the world; it bars the road of progress: that corpse of the past, to call it by its proper name without circumlocution, is no other than Catholicism. Yes! Catholicism is a dead body. If we have not

* M. Frère, the Prime Minister, who is a Deist, made another attempt in the sitting of the 27th of May to persuade the Belgian nation that the Law of 1842 constituted education undenominational, and that it was only slightly different from the present Bill. If this be true, we ask, Why change that Law? Why create such a commotion in the country for nothing? The truth is, the leader of the Right, M. Malou, demolished that figment effectually in the sitting of the 28th.

yet buried it, we have, at least, carried it a few steps nearer to the grave.”*

These, honourable Ministers, these are the aspirations of the lodges whose representatives you are in the Government. Permit me to say that others before you have meditated the destruction of Catholicism, and dug its grave; they have passed away long ago; “their corpse no longer bars the road of progress;” and yet Catholicism is living still. Eighteen hundred years ago the chief priests carefully sealed its tomb and set guards over it. It ought never to have come out; yet, a few years afterwards a persecutor, miraculously converted, wrote to the Christians of Rome. “Your faith is spoken of in the whole world.”† During three hundred years the most powerful Emperors in their fury sought to destroy it by persecutions; they flattered themselves that they had buried it in the catacombs, and, behold, it reappears under Constantine more vigorous than ever. There arose an apostate Emperor; he undertook to annihilate Christianity, and to dig the grave of the “Galilæan.” We know what took place, and we have not forgotten the cry of despair which death forced from him—“Galilæan! thou hast conquered.” Since that time many others more powerful than you, down to Luther, to Henry VIII., to Robespierre, have dug the grave of Catholicism. They have disappeared, and the sun of Catholicism

Pursues unchecked its onward course,
Darting its rays with torrent force
On these blasphemers’ heads.

The “Galilæan” has vanquished them all. He vanquished the barbaric hordes, and bent them under the yoke of the Church. He has overthrown all heresies one after another. He has reformed laxity of morals; he has made Europe Christian, and organized the noble civilization whose fruits you enjoy. He called forth those men of genius, those orators, poets, painters, those wonderful artists whose works you admire. The priests whom you expel from the schools of Belgium, the monks whose character you blacken, are the men who cleared our forests, fertilized our fields, drained our marshes, built our cathedrals, with their windows shedding their “dim religious light,” their tall spires, their thousand chef-d’œuvres; who formed masters of thought like Anselm, like Thomas of Aquin, like Bonaventura, those orators who bear the honoured names of Bossuet and Lacordaire. Cite after this the deeds of Freemasons!‡

* Words of M. Van Humbeek, present Minister of Public Instruction, at the Antwerp Lodge, the 26th of December, 1864. † Rom. i. 8.

‡ Yes, that Church which you speak of as a corpse, others besides you, and before you, have attacked her, and predicted her destruction. She has sat upon their tomb. She will see the grave of many more yet. And when

In 1846 the Liberals protested that they wished the school to be religious, and the priest in the school; they insisted only that he should not be admitted except in State shackles. In spite of this mitigation, and notwithstanding that the Liberal party held the reins of Government from 1847 till 1870, not one of the Ministers who succeeded each other, even of those belonging to the Cabinet of M. Frère, ever dared to propose the revision of the Law of 1842.

What no Minister hitherto has dared to attempt, the Lodges of Belgium, having become Atheistic, have insisted shall be done. M. Frère has accepted the task, and the new Minister of Public Instruction,* the avowed representative of the Lodges, has submitted it to the deliberations of Parliament.

This new Bill reproduces a good many of the regulations of the Law of 1842. It also adds a few new Articles, which might prove very useful, with respect to the *gardiennes* schools and the schools of adults; but it abrogates, modifies, or suppresses what was most important in the Law of 1842, what gave that Law all its force, its success, that which was the mainspring of all the progress made in education; it violates the rights of the Communes, disorganizes the Normal Schools, destroys the spirit which animated them for good, and banishes religion, without which there may possibly be instruction, but real education, never. The Bill has been correctly characterized as "a Bill for disorganizing primary education."†

According to the Law of 1842, the school was denominational. The teaching of religion by ministers of religion formed neces-

their corpse shall have become, according to Bossuet's expression, "un je ne sais quoi qui n'a de nom dans aucune langue," the Church shall continue to diffuse, amongst Christian populations, the light and the blessings of her teaching.

* The Ministry of Public Instruction was created last year with a view to the projected Law, and others which are to follow. Up to that time Public Instruction belonged to the Ministry of the Interior.

† "It has been statistically proved that the total cost of primary education since 1843 exceeds 371,000,000 of francs. I draw attention to this figure not because I regret it—on the contrary, I am glad of it; but I ask myself, Shall we not have to regret that expense by-and-by? The new Law, far from increasing the number of pupils, will have the effect of diminishing them from day to day. On its first introduction the staff of teachers will not be changed; there will be no choice between the State school and ignorance. But in proportion as your new trained teachers shall be appointed to schools in our numerous Catholic Communes, desertion will increase as fast as the efforts of our party shall succeed in establishing free schools in opposition to yours. You are about to inaugurate a retrograde movement in public education. It is evident that the nuns who now teach little girls will withdraw from the schools."—Speech of M. Malou, leader of the Right, in the sitting of the 28th of May.

sarily a part of the programme of studies. The purpose of the new Bill is to establish undenominational schools, instruction without dogma, godless education; for, in order to please freethinkers, who do not exist in any considerable number, except in the towns, religion is entirely excluded from the programme. Only by a trick that will deceive no one, lessons in religion are to be tolerated out of school hours in some part of the building.

Here are the principal clauses of the Bill.

Art. 4. The teaching of religion is left to the care of families, and the ministers of the different denominations.* A room in the school is put at the disposal of ministers of religion for the purpose of giving, either before or after school-time, religious instruction to the children of their Communion frequenting the school.

Art. 5. Primary education shall comprise morality, reading, writing, object lessons, the elements of arithmetic, including the legal system of weights and measures, the elements of French, Flemish, or German, according to the requirements of different localities, geography, the history of Belgium, the elements of drawing, including the knowledge of geometrical figures, gymnastics, singing; and for girls, needle work.

To make these regulations still more objectionable the Bill suppresses the supervision of the clergy over the schools; Clerical Inspectors are suppressed; the teachers are to be trained in the State Normal Schools, in which there will be no longer a course of religion—in Normal Schools which will be godless like the Primary Schools. The books selected for teaching are to be examined by the Council of Progress,† and approved by the Government only. The ministers of religion are to have no concern with them, not even with respect to books on religion and morality. Finally, the Communes will be compelled to have one or more schools, and will not be permitted, as they have hitherto been, the liberty of choosing masters and mistresses from whatever Normal School they think proper; but will be forced to choose their staff of teachers from State Schools, in which there will be no longer any spirit of religion, where the spirit of morality will be lost with faith, and where the masters will preach indifference. It is only when there may be a deficiency of teachers in the State Schools that permission will be given to take teachers from the Free Schools. Such are the principal clauses of the new Bill. At the time I am writing

* It was perfectly useless to declare that "the teaching of religion is left to the care of families." Everybody knows that no one requires leave from the Government to teach religion to his children. As it has been well said, "these words are a mask, a blind, a throwing of dust in the eyes." They pretend to have no animosity against religion, whilst they brutally place it outside of the law.

† "Conseil de Perfectionnement."

four weeks have been spent in a general debate on this Bill in the Chamber of Representatives, and it is not yet terminated. The members of the Right oppose the Bill with all their force. The Minister of Public Instruction has replied, seeking to extenuate by denials the hostile provisions of the Bill; but the more advanced of the party, Crombez, Janson, Bergé, Couvreur, have indulged in a reckless cynicism of language against the Bishops and clergy which would not be tolerated with respect to any other class of citizens.

Catholics observe, in the first place, that this Bill does not admit priests into the schools except by placing them in a position that they cannot accept. Religion is degraded; it is placed below gymnastics and sewing. Gymnastics form *necessarily* a part of the programme of studies; but religion which teaches man what he is, whence he comes, whither he goes, is excluded. At most, it is the pleasure of these men to merely permit it to be taught either before or after class. But as the programme of studies embraces so much, there is left scarcely any free time either before or after class. Before class, most frequently, it will be impossible. For in most villages, on account of distance, especially in winter, the children cannot reach school before work has begun. After class the lesson will be without fruit. How can they think that a child, already fatigued by two or three hours of class, can then study with fruit that branch of its education which requires the most attention? Gymnastics may well be given after class; gymnastics consist of only corporeal exercises. But with religion, which initiates the child into the mysteries of God and of man, and virtues the most sublime, the case is very different.

Besides, the position in which the minister of religion is thus placed diminishes his dignity, and takes from the religious course the respect due to it. What! A professor of drawing, a teacher of drill, a sewing mistress, is admitted into the school, and has a right to enforce his or her teaching, and to punish inattentive or unruly children, and the priest is to be left at the door! When the others have all done he is to be allowed, as a favour, to come in—perhaps after the master has depreciated his teaching and preached indifference; those may listen to him who wish, those may go who like. Is not this to degrade, in the eyes of the children, religion and its ministers—that is to say, all that they hold most sacred? Religion is the safeguard of the faith and the morals of childhood; in it is centred the very highest concern of the family, of society, of the State, of the Church—and it is to be put after gymnastics! The religious teaching is to be optional, unsanctioned, excluded from inspection, emulation, or prizes, and in such circumstances the priest *will be permitted*,

if he has the time for it,* to teach Catechism—what mockery! Have they not offered this concession to the clergy only because they hoped it would not be accepted?

The Minister asserts that he cannot include religion among the obligatory subjects of instruction, because the liberty of conscience guaranteed by the Constitution would be violated. According to him the Belgian Constitution establishes "the absolute separation of the State from the Church." This separation, still according to him, requires *neutral* teaching and *neutral* teachers. There is therefore only the indifferent school, without religion or dogma, the school without God, which can be Constitutional. The Law of 1842, which ranges religion among the subjects to be taught, and confides the explanation of it to a minister of the worship professed by the scholars, violates the Constitution; it must disappear!

The Law of 1842 unconstitutional! Here, assuredly, we have a new pretence; it needed all the lights of the Lodges to discover it, and all their audacity to maintain it. What! This Law was voted unanimously by all the members of the Senate, and by all the members of the Chamber, save three voices. Liberals voted it as well as Catholics. Many of the members who then sat in the Legislative Chambers had taken part in the National Congress. There were among them learned lawyers and eminent magistrates. They all affirmed with pleasure, as we have seen above, the necessity of a religious education, and the necessity, in order to have such education, of concluding an alliance with the Church, with a view to preserving social order and to establishing in Belgium an earnest, efficient education that would correspond with the wishes of parents. It was the price of educational prosperity. Not one of them perceived that the Law of 1842 violated the Constitution. Perhaps it will be pretended that the men who made the Constitution—upright magistrates, informed juriconsults, men devoted to their country—may not have understood, and did not understand, the Con-

* Often enough the priest will not be able to go to the school. The demands of his ministry, mass, burial service, sick calls, confessions, baptisms, marriages, will detain him elsewhere. Often, too, there will be several schools to one priest. Then, lastly, he will have to teach Catechism to all the classes at once, which is not a possibility. Not being able to deny the justness of these observations, which have been made to him by several members of the Right, the Minister of Public Instruction has softened his language. Now he shows himself if disposed to charge the teacher with the Catechism lesson, in default of the priest, even to indemnify him for it, even to allow him to take the first half-hour of the school time if the children cannot manage to arrive earlier. But meantime he changes nothing, he wishes to change nothing of the Law. It is thus they attempt to mislead opinion.

stitution which they had made? Since that time, now thirty-seven years ago, Liberals,* equally with Catholics, have found the Law Constitutional. And it is only to-day that they have found themselves to have been all this time mistaken. What do I say?—even to-day the Liberals are not all of one mind about it. M. Pirmez, a former Liberal Minister, has proved it in the debate. Many among them regret that their party should have thrown itself into the venture. They are fathers; they think of their children. And if they did not owe a blind obedience to the chiefs who lead them, they would vote for the maintenance of a Law the disappearance of which will be a public calamity, and a source of division in the country, and will draw with it the downfall of primary education in Belgium.

Besides, it is false, absolutely false, that the Law of 1842 is unconstitutional; it is the new Bill which deserves that name. It is false that the Constitution establishes the absolute separation of Church and State, and requires neutrality of teaching. It would require the impossible. The Constitution is a work of compromise; a work of good faith between the different parties, as between the different religions, which compose the Belgian nation. It established, not absolute principles, but practical rules; a *modus vivendi* which was from the first accepted loyally by all, and which the Catholics have, all and always, vigorously and faithfully observed, although some had no sympathy with Constitutional Government. The Constitution did not proclaim the absolute separation of Church and State, but their relative independence. Article 117, which places the salaries of the clergy to the account of the State, proves this unmistakably. Besides, when the State wishes to teach, it ought to give the teaching demanded by parents and by the needs of society, and such teaching necessarily includes religion, which cannot be given by any others than the ministers of religion or under their direction. But here our Bishops must speak:—

No principle of the Constitution sanctions the impious system of excluding religious teaching from public schools.

It is altogether inexact, first of all, that our national Charter places God outside the State and outside the Law, as certain adversaries pretend, in order thence to conclude that the Government ought to have nothing to say to anything which concerns religion.

Consequently, in favouring the civilizing work of the Church, in giving its co-operation to the development of the Church's legitimate influence, the State, far from placing itself in contradiction to the Constitution, conforms to its spirit, and, still more, performs an act of political wisdom.

* M. Frère has been twenty years in power, during which time he has upheld the Law of 1842.

It is not less illogical to found the exclusion of religious teaching from public schools on the neutrality imposed on the State, in view of the various forms of religion. This neutrality is, in fact, altogether derived from the equal liberty which the Constitution promises and guarantees to all religious communions; and hence it is manifest that, far from obliging the State to impede or paralyze that liberty, neutrality imposes on it the mission of protecting it, and rendering it possible and easy for each form of religion. But what will the secularization of schools effect, if not the paralysis and even suppression, as regards children and youth, of the principal exercise of every form of worship—namely, the dogmatic and moral teaching of its adherents, without which neither conviction, practice, nor religious worship is possible? To guarantee to the Catholic religion freedom of exercise, and to close against its ministers the doors of the school, where moral and religious teaching ought to be given to youth, is it not as inconsequent—to illustrate our thought with a comparison—as to decree freedom of industry and commerce, and to close forthwith the sea-port, and the market, to all manufacturers and traders, under pretext of guarding a perfect neutrality towards all? The only conclusion which can be drawn from this Constitutional neutrality is that the Government ought to accord the same protection and the enjoyment of the same rights to all religions. And it is this precisely which the law now in force does.

The proscription of religious instruction in primary schools is again unconstitutional in this, that it overlooks the sacred right of fathers over the education of their children and violates liberty of conscience.

The voice of religion agrees with the voice of Nature in proclaiming that the education of children belongs not to the State,* but to their parents, and that it is for them at once a right and a duty. The schoolmaster only represents the father; he is a delegate charged by him to advance and finish the noble task of educating his children; and to fulfil the task, he ought to instruct and bring them up in such a manner that they may find at school a continuation of home. Therefore the State, in opening, at the expense of the nation, public schools in order to facilitate the education of childhood and youth, is obliged to respect this right inherent in paternity, and so to organize schools as to permit the teacher to fulfil his honourable work conformably to the requirements of his commission.

And can it, *bonâ fide*, be denied that the education of the family rests on religion, and that the first desire of the father who entrusts his child to a school is to see it receive not only solid instruction, but rather an education which renders his child docile, respectful, God-fearing—in a word, a religious education? To open, at the cost of the public treasury, schools from which religious teaching and influence is banished, in order to teach the children only the elements of letters and profane sciences, is therefore to employ the resources of parents in

* M. Laurent has lately written in the *Revue de Belgique* that "the instruction of children belongs to the State." Other champions of Liberalism have upheld the same doctrine.

payment of an education which their hearts and their consciences equally condemn; is to place the parents in the moral impossibility of fulfilling the grave duty of training their children in a Christian manner; is to violate their liberty of conscience in that precisely which is most dear to them and most sacred.

The truth of this conclusion will appear more manifest still if it is considered that the neutral or secularized school is necessarily irreligious or hostile to the Church. For, even supposing it possible to give children sufficient instruction without touching on religious questions, what effect must be produced on these young minds and hearts by the systematic abstention from all affirmation concerning everything touching on God, their souls, Jesus Christ, the Church, their immortal destiny, except only indifference and contempt? What esteem can they have for a science of which their masters make so little count that they have relegated it among the things which have no bearing on their instruction and education? If our Lord has said of those who do not care to follow Him and walk under His banner: *he who is not with Me is against Me*, is it not clear that we may say also that the education which is not Christian is necessarily anti-Christian? Besides, even by reducing instruction to reading, writing, and arithmetic, the so-called neutral education is impossible. In reality, Christianity which has changed the face of the world and has filled all the centuries, is mixed up with everything, with science as with art, with letters as with history, so that there is no species of knowledge into which the religious element does not enter. Thus, experience has shown that in the schools without God, the teaching of religion has been excluded only the more freely to attack the Catholic Church, and that in place of forming Christians they formed there only freethinkers.*

So that it is not the Law of 1842 which is unconstitutional, but rather the new Bill. This the members of the Right have unanswerably shown during the discussion.

The new Bill is unconstitutional in many respects: firstly, because it imposes neutral teaching and a neutral teacher, which our fundamental pact neither wished nor could wish to do. Our Bishops have established, in the words just quoted, that our national Charter did not exclude God, as some of our adversaries pretend; that it desired not indifferentism, but liberty; that the neutrality observed by it towards the various forms of religion does not demand neutral teaching, and does not exclude religion. Further, education absolutely and completely neutral is impossible even in a primary school.† Doubtless one may teach a child to

* Lettre Pastorale de S. Em. le Cardinal Archevêque et de NN. SS. les Evêques de Belgique, du 7 Déc., 1878.

† On the impossibility of a neutral school see Cardinal Dechamps "Le Nouveau Projet de Loi sur l'Enseignement Primaire." Mechlin, Dessain, 1879. The learned author there demonstrates that the pretended neutrality of a school in connection with religion, history, and morals, is

read, to write, and to sum, without introducing any dogma, though, indeed, ordinarily it is not so, and reading and writing lessons may have for their subject moral and religious truths; but how is a child to be taught its mother tongue, as the programme requires, without explaining to it the words—God, soul, providence, future life, church, mass, sacrament, and so many others which belong to Christian doctrine, and are constantly in the mouths of the people? And how can these words be explained, without declaring for or against Christianity? How shall the teacher explain the great facts of Belgian history—also in the programme—the conversion of the Franks, the effects of Christian civilization, the deeds of Charlemagne, the Crusades, the troubles of the sixteenth century, the upheavings of the French Revolution, without bringing in sentiments either religious, indifferent, or sceptical? The teacher will have religious opinions of his own; he will be a Catholic, as are at present nearly all the teachers, or a freethinker, as they nearly all will be when they come from the new Normal Schools: how can he succeed in never letting the children see what his opinions are? The Catholic children, so observant at their tender and impressionable age, will see that the teacher never makes the sign of a Christian, that he never prays, that there is no crucifix in the school, that the priest is not liked there; and as religion is identified for him with the priest, judge what danger of perversion will hence arise for that young innocent soul, beautiful, but weak and fragile, in which religion must constantly repress inclination.

Catholicism does not admit the "neutral" school. The Bill organizes schools on a footing which will render attendance at them impossible* to the children of Catholic families—who form an immense majority of the nation, and, with a few exceptions, the whole of the rural communes. The Bill overlooks, therefore, without any motive, without signaling any abuse, the most cherished interests, the most sacred rights of an immense majority of Belgian families; and that for the benefit of some few freethinkers who wish to live and die without religion and without God, and who are scarcely to be found except in the large towns. For the greater part of the Liberals, even of those who will vote for the Law, are far from desiring godless schools for their own children; they will continue to send their

only a mask which hides indifferentism, and that such neutrality is both unconstitutional and anti-social. The author says: "I have never seen a neutral master, a neutral book, a neutral history, a neutral philosophy, or neutral morality—such things are chimeras, mere nonsense, lies."

* Such attendance is forbidden: the decisions of the Holy See for the United States and for Ireland indicate in what grave cases and under what conditions Catholic parents can avail themselves of these schools. We do not treat here of this side of the question.

sons and daughters to some Catholic boarding-school, or will keep them at home with private tutors. They are rich and can do so. But, as one of my colleagues* has very well said, they must bear the responsibility of the religious tyranny which would oblige the *nation* to hand over its children to apostasy.

All Belgians should have the power of gaining any public office for which they are qualified. This is a right guaranteed to every one by the Constitution. The Bill is a violation of this right. Henceforth, in order to occupy the post of teacher in the Communal Schools, it will be necessary to have a diploma granted by the official Normal Schools, in which Catholic students will find only a neutral teaching which hurts their consciences. Young people who shall have studied in the clerical Normal Schools, will only be received in exceptional cases. So that, on one side, our Charter proclaims all Belgians equal before the law, and equally eligible to all public employments; on the other, it proclaims liberty of education; while here we have young people brought up in private Normal Schools not able to gain the position of teacher. The State will not be satisfied with fighting against free establishments by a lavish budget; contrary to the Constitution, it will close against them the gate of public employments. Let it reflect: we dare to prophesy. Its Normal Schools will be deserted. The young people will shun these sinks of perdition, in spite of all the attractions of Government favour; parents will dread sending their children to them. In a few years teachers will not be forthcoming, and the State will be obliged to take incapable subjects, or to beg from the clerical schools, which it now rejects so disdainfully. The new Law will exclude our Normal Schools. We shall support them by the aid of Catholic charity. They will supply to the schools which we shall raise against the official schools, in order to save the child's soul, teachers both efficient and Christian.

The Government knows all the odiousness of its project to Catholics; it understands well that the official schools will never enjoy the confidence of Christian families; it will constrain its officials; it will compel the poor to frequent them through the relieving officers (*bureaux de bienfaisance*). But in spite of that the official schools will be deserted. Belgium, which has never allowed its faith to be touched, neither at the time of the Reform, nor under Joseph II., nor under William—Belgium, whose attachment to Catholicity forms, as our adversaries acknowledge, the *national character*, is not ripe for apostasy. The Lodges will not be more powerful than was William or Joseph II. A general movement of condemnation has arisen;

* In the *Revue Catholique* for 1879, p. 225.

it will grow; legal resistance is taking form and shape; and it will assume wider proportions. The Government feels all the gravity of the situation into which it has so madly thrown itself: it dare not appeal to the elections. If it dared, it would be overthrown to-morrow. It tries, therefore, to soften the terms of the Bill; it has placarded in every Commune, and distributed to the electors, circulars reassuring the people, and persuading them that nothing is intended against religion. It proclaims loudly Article 5 of the Bill, which orders *moral* teaching in the schools, and adds, "teachers will speak of God, and of the soul, and of future life," but "without any dogmatic teaching." Who cannot see the trick? Teachers will speak of God, the soul, future life, but without Christian teaching. They will not, then, be able to speak of *our* God, the only true and living; they will not be able to speak of the immortal soul, created to His image, and bought by the blood of Jesus Christ, purified by baptism, and called to participate in supernatural and divine glory; they will not be able to speak of eternal rewards and punishments. For all that is dogmatic teaching. The God of whom they may speak will be a Torso, a mutilated God, deprived wholly or in part of His Divine attributes; it will be a God blasphemously disfigured; far from having created man to His image, he will be fashioned to the notions and the image of man; he will be Nature for the materialists, the great All for the Pantheists, the "*devenir*" for the Hegelians. The future life will be a life which does not include either heaven or hell, neither rewards nor pains eternal, a life according to the needs and taste of free-thinkers and free-livers. Such is the religious instruction which is promised us by these fallacious words. But the perfidy of the language is unmasked. It cannot long make dupes. The Minister of Public Instruction felt that something more was needed to reassure public opinion. Replying to the incisive and eloquent speech of M. Jacobs, and not knowing how to escape from the solid and close argumentation in which he had entangled him, he went so far as to say that the Government would admit a crucifix into the school.

But if this be so, if your words, M. le Ministre, be sincere, wherefore your Bill to exclude it? Why not with the crucifix admit Christian doctrine which tells what it is, and without which it is nothing—nothing but a bit of wood, fit to be burnt. You cast off Christian doctrine under pretence that it wounds neutrality—in which case, why does not the crucifix, the foundation of all Christian doctrine, also wound it? Christ is a dogma: how can you reconcile Him with the neutrality of your schools? The Common Council of Brussels, composed of your friends, is more consistent. Under pretext of neutrality it has

just cleared all the *gardiennes* schools of the town of their crucifixes. Your friends will do the same everywhere they can, as soon as your Law is passed. *Against* them, indeed, they will have your words of to-day, but *for* them your Law, your words of yesterday and perhaps to-morrow.

Again, it is an attempt to mislead public opinion to say that there will be *moral* teaching in the schools. We ask, What morals? Because it would appear that there are morals and morals. For our part we know only one kind. We know that morality which is called *natural* because God inscribed it on the heart of man, which teaches us our duty to the Deity, to ourselves, to our neighbour. Right reason, illumined by the light of truth, knows it more or less perfectly. For human reason, "always wanting on one side or another" ("*toujours court par quelque endroit*") mixes with it both its errors and prejudices. The ancient philosophers disfigured it with gross errors. Only Christianity has traced its precepts in clear lines and without mixture of error. Is this the morality they speak of? Then, why not say Christian morality. Protestants, Anglicans, even Jews, do not ask any other. But this is not the morality required. This morality contains some precepts too troublesome for certain of their severe moralists, who, under the cloak of parliamentary immunity, have treated the bishops and clergy so roughly. So they must have another morality; though they are not too clear what. For the members of the Left cannot at all arrange it. M. Le Hardy candidly avows this. Not having been able, as he says, to catch from the words of the speakers who preceded him, what morality is, he, in his turn, essays a definition: "Morality is the *ensemble* of a man's duties to his fellows." A man's duties to God, according to him, belong to religion, and there can be no question of religion in schools where childhood is to be formed to virtue. We pity M. Le Hardy's adepts. Happily, the Minister of Public Instruction is not one of them. For him morality is "the universal conscience which says to all men that they are brothers." It would appear, then, that the conscience of Plato which permitted the murder of infants born deformed, that of Aristotle which distinguished men born slaves and men free, that of the Brahmins which divides humanity into four hostile castes, that of the Anthropopagi who devour their fellows: it would appear, I say, that all these consciences ought to belong to the universal conscience—and yet it must be acknowledged that they signally broke this law of human fraternity.* And so this theory does not in

* Cfr. "La Morale Universelle et Indépendante," by Card. Dechamps. Mechlin, Dessain, 1878.

the least please Citizen Janson, the Brussels Deputy. He has examined all, from Moses, Plato, Christ, Mahomet, up to himself, and he cannot find this universal conscience; but he has discovered that the Decalogue given to Moses on Mount Sinai is "immoral," that the gospel morality is superannuated, and that the true morality is at present only in the process of formation—doubtless, since he took it in hand. Briefly, the moral teaching of the schools will not be Christian; that is no longer desired. It will, therefore, be "independent morality," independent of all dogma, of all beliefs, independent of God, Who is the source and eternal rule of morality; a morality which every man will fashion his own way, and for the rule, authority, and source of which he will look to human nature alone. This morality will change at each one's will and caprice. This is what they offer us to form the infant heart to virtue and to curb the passions of the young!

In closing these lines, written for a Review published in a country where liberty is understood, I cannot help a feeling of sadness as I think of the evils which the enemies of liberty are preparing for my own! A Belgian and a Catholic, profoundly attached to my fatherland, to its free institutions, to its secular traditions, to the Catholic Faith in which I was born, and which I have served in the priesthood and by teaching for these twenty-five years—to that Catholic Faith the secular heritage which Belgium has kept intact through so many vicissitudes, and which since 1830 has covered our land with innumerable works of charity, of the apostolate, of education, I feel a painful emotion possess my soul at the thought of the ruin which the disastrous law of which I have been writing will heap on my country; at the thought of the divisions it will cause, of the souls of so many children—innocent victims—which it will snatch from God and from eternal salvation. My grief breaks forth in spite of me when I see my country, hitherto so happy, abandoned to the adventurous experiments of sophists, to the avidity, the egoism, and the insolence of the Atheistical Lodges;* when I see religion on the point of being chased away as an enemy from those asylums, in part founded by her, where she formed youth to all the Christian and civil virtues under the eye of God; when I think of education, to-day so flourishing, to be so soon disorganized by intolerance under the outraged name of Liberty.

But the Christian never despairs. I have confidence that the wisdom of the Senate will spare Belgium the evils which I foresee.

* M. Cornesse, a Catholic Deputy, demonstrated by a multitude of Masonic documents, in the Session of the 28th May, that the Bill is the work of the Lodges, and that it was drawn up in the Lodge of Antwerp.

But if Providence permits that we should be tried, and that the insane Bill I have explained should become law, there remains for us private education; and we shall make use of it. We shall unite our forces; we shall appeal to the charity of all; in spite of all difficulties we shall build schools wherever we can. Religion shall hold the first place in them; profaner knowledge shall not be neglected there. Whatever there is in modern progress we shall turn to use. But far from our schools be those novelties—the vain display of self-love and vanity—which can only draw childhood away from its path and the people from their position. We shall continue to form children to the Christian virtues, and at the same time to useful knowledge. We shall have our Normal Schools, wherein to train honest and virtuous teachers. With them we shall combat the Official Schools; and I dare to predict that, at the end of a few years, if it persists in maintaining its Law, and in spite of its overflowing budget of twenty-two millions of francs, the State will be frightened at the sight of its empty schools.

T. J. LAMY.

* * * The hopes expressed in the lines just written have not been realised. On Wednesday, June 18th, the Senate passed the Education Bill by a majority of two. One Senator did not vote. Only one member of the Left—the Prince de Ligne, President of the Senate—had the strength of character to resist the pressure of the Ministry, and to vote according to his convictions. He had the courage to tell his party that the proposed Law was a Law of division, of war, and of misery, which the Liberals of the Congress of 1830, of whom he himself was one, would never have voted for. Such words, uttered by a partisan of the Ministers, are a verdict of condemnation.

It should be observed that this most serious Law, which affects the religious interests of a whole nation, is imposed upon us by a single vote—that of M. Boyaval, Liberal Senator for Bruges. He is ill, and he had himself carried to the Senate to give his vote. At his election for Bruges he had a majority of one, and that vote was his own. It is owing to him that this Bill has become law; if he had not voted the votes would have been equal and the Bill would have been rejected.

In the Chamber of Deputies the Bill was only carried by a majority of seven. Three of these declared that they voted against their personal convictions, and only in order not to separate themselves from their party. One member, for the same reason, abstained from voting. If these four members had had the courage of their convictions, like the Prince de Ligne, the Bill would never have passed the Deputies. It becomes a question

whether, under these circumstances, the Bill will receive the royal assent, without which it cannot become law.

Whatever happens, the Catholics of Belgium have plain warning of the danger that threatens them; and they should lose no time in providing schools for themselves. At Louvain, where these words are written, a beginning has already been made. On June 17th a large site was purchased, and arrangements are being made to have it ready to receive children by the coming October. Contributions and subscriptions are flowing in, and, with what we already have, our schools will run the State schools very close; and the latter will not long enjoy their honours and their victory.

The Belgian Bishops, as soon as the vote of the Senate was made known, addressed to their dioceses a joint Pastoral Letter, in which, after having rehearsed the various reasons that we have pointed out against the new Law, they thus condemn and brand this work of Masonic Liberalism, and at the same time point out to the faithful their duty. We give their grave words:

"Consequently, resting on the authority of the Holy See and docile to its teaching; in union with the Bishops of the whole Catholic world, and notably with the venerable Fathers of the Second National Council of Baltimore (1866 tit. ix., chap. i.), of the First and Fourth Provincial Councils of Westminster (1852 and 1873), of the First, Second, and Third Provincial Councils of Quebec (1851, 1854, and 1863), of the First Provincial Council of Halifax (1857), of the Provincial Council of Sydney (1869), of the Provincial Council of Utrecht (1865), of the Provincial Council of Cologne (1860), of the Assemblies of Irish Bishops held at Maynooth, August 18, 1869, and at Dublin in October, 1871; in fulfilment of our pastoral charge, we denounce the school *régime* which the Civil Power intends to apply to our country, 'as dangerous and hurtful: We declare that it favours the spread of unbelief and indifferentism, and that it is an attempt against the faith, the piety, and the religious rights of the Belgian people.' And, for these reasons, 'We reprobate and condemn it.'

"Again, conforming ourselves to the teaching of the Holy See contained in the already cited Letter of Pius IX. to the Archbishop of Freiburg, and availing ourselves of the Pontiff's own words: 'We warn all the faithful, and make known to them that they cannot in conscience attend such schools, founded, as they are, in opposition to the Catholic Church.'

"Observe carefully, dear brethren, that these words of the Pope are derived from a principle, and constitute a rule—a rule applicable to all countries, 'in all places,' he says, 'where the pernicious design is formed, or still more executed, of withdrawing

schools from the authority of the Church, and where, in consequence, youth will be miserably exposed to the danger of losing its faith.' This principle and rule is also recalled by the Congregation of the Holy Office, in its instruction to the Bishops of the United States, approved of by Pius IX. on the 24th November, 1875.

"If the application of this rule in all its rigour is sometimes impossible in countries where the Catholic inhabitants are in a feeble minority, mingled with Dissenters of different sects, wanting the necessary means of establishing schools of their own creed and without Catholic schools accessible to their children, it is not so in Belgium. Modifications elsewhere necessary will be scarcely ever applicable with us.

"Consequently no father and no mother can in conscience place their children in a public school under the *régime* of the new Law, if there be in the place any Catholic school, or if there be a school in the neighbourhood accessible to their children, or if they are able in any other way to provide for their instruction. This prohibition applies to guardians and others to whose charge children are confided.

"We do not think it necessary to explain in detail what Catholic fathers, guardians, or others ought to do in cases different from those defined in the preceding rule; such cases will only be temporary, until, in the very near future, a perfectly organized Catholic school shall be established in every parish. In these exceptional cases each head of a family will consult the priest of his parish, who, after hearing the reasons, will report them to the Bishop in proper form, and the Bishop will decide.

"If it is not permitted in conscience to any head of a family to entrust his children to schools under the new Law, it cannot be permitted to any Catholic, by any spontaneous act, to support such schools, or to assist the execution of such Law. Catholics, therefore, cannot accept school duties; for example, they cannot sit on school committees.

"Pope Pius IX. in his Letter, already cited, to the Archbishop of Freiburg, decides, and the Bishops of the United States, of Holland and Ireland, repeat that 'there is most certainly a very serious obligation on the Church, on laymen, and on the clergy to employ all possible means to provide for Catholic youth Christian education and teaching.'

"The duties of which the Head of the Church reminds us are summed up in two words: 'Let us work and pray.' Let prayer second work, and work prayer. Let us trust to the Divine assistance, for all depends on God; and let us work, employing all human means, as if all depended on ourselves alone.

"The struggle begins from this moment; it will be long and arduous. You, dear brethren, will accept it with a determination worthy of your character of Catholics and Belgians, whilst repeating the cry of your forefathers, '*Dieu le veut.*' God wills it! The honour of His Name, the preservation of faith and piety in the souls of your children and in your families, the salvation of our dear and Catholic country—this is at stake. We shall not carry on the battle successfully except by great and constant zealous efforts, by abundant and persevering sacrifices of our means, by the concurrence of the charity of all. Such efforts and sacrifices, Heaven helping us, we shall make, and we have the hope that God will inspire you all with the will to take part generously with us.

"Never was a more urgent duty laid on your piety or your patriotism. We emphasize this consideration, and we borrow and adapt to our position the words which the holy and wise Pontiff who now governs the Church of God, Leo XIII., addressed, a few months ago, to his Cardinal-Vicar, and through him to the clergy and faithful of Rome: 'The defence of the truth and of religion is incumbent on us all, clergy and laity; the success of the defence will depend very specially on the abundance of pecuniary aid it can command. As to ourselves, we are resolved to contribute as largely as we can to this work—a Catholic work by excellence; we shall consecrate to it all our diocesan and private means. But what are these resources to the enormous amount required? We shall need the assistance, and a large and generous assistance, of our flocks.'

"Already in Belgium, since 1830, a number of families, recognising the obligations of birth, and still more, of faith, have established and supported at their expense schools where children receive instruction appropriate to their social condition, and, at the same time, the knowledge of Catholic doctrine and the practice of the Christian virtues. But these exceptional good works have now to be made general, and their benefit cannot be spread everywhere except by the concurrence of all. Thus we hope, we are certain, that the Catholics of Belgium, animated by the desire of good and the love of God and of souls, and especially those to whom Providence has given a large share of earthly wealth—convinced as they ought to be of the absolute and urgent necessity of providing the young with Christian schools—will count it a duty and an honour to furnish us with the means of establishing them in every parish where they are needed, and of supporting them.

"We need not stimulate the emulation of our clergy in this union of all the faithful for the erection and support of Catholic schools. The Belgian clergy will be outdone by none in gene-

rosity or devotedness. The Catholic priesthood has always figured at the head of every work undertaken for the honour of God and the good of souls: the glorious traditions of the priesthood of Belgium strikingly attest how they have always nobly understood their sublime mission, and they will fulfil it in the present instance. We already know of the admirable acts of charity, in this matter, of numbers of our priests who are comparatively poor.

"If all, clergy and laity, cannot help the work by large gifts, few indeed among them will be unable to contribute to it an alms of a few *centimes* per week, or month, or year, and all can help it on, whether by reminding fathers and mothers of their grave obligation of bringing up their families as Christians, or by teaching prayers and the Catechism to the young, or by themselves undertaking the duties of schoolmaster or mistress. To work, then, very dear brethren, to work! *Dieu le veut!* God wills it!

"Given at Mechlin, the 12th June, 1879.

" + VICTOR AUGUSTE CARDINAL DECHAMPS,
Archbishop of Mechlin.

" + THEODORE, Bishop of Liège.

" + JOHN JOSEPH, Bishop of Bruges.

" + HENRY, Bishop of Ghent.

" + THEODORE JOSEPH, Bishop of Namur.

" + EDMUND, Bishop of Tournay."*

T. J. L.

ART. VIII.—CARDINAL NEWMAN.

Lives of the Cardinals. By PATRICK JUSTIN O'BYRNE.

Part VI. London: Roland, Ladelle & Co. 1879.

THE sixth number, just published, of this interesting and sumptuous publication, contains most appropriately a lengthy biography of Cardinal Newman. As far as we have read the preceding numbers, they are accurate and well written. A few mistakes no doubt occur here and there; as when the writer says of Cardinal Manning that his name was sent up as *dignissimus* by the Chapter of Westminster, after the death of Cardinal Wiseman. What the Chapter does is to select three names, which are sent in without any qualification whatever; and whether Provost Manning was first, second, or third, or whether he was there at all, Mr. O'Byrne, he must pardon us for saying, cannot be sure

* This Pastoral was printed immediately after the vote in the Deputies, and published when the Bill passed the Senate.

that he knows. The historical sketch of the Tractarian movement, and of the effects of the "Gorham" and "Hampden" cases in the "Life of Cardinal Manning," is very strikingly done. The work, with its very fair full-page lithographed portraits, will be very useful and, we hope, popular.

By way of preface to this paper we cannot do better than transcribe the Address which was delivered by Cardinal Newman, with all the marks of careful preparation, at Rome, in the residence of Cardinal Howard, on May 12th last.

His Eminence spoke as follows:—"Vi ringrazio, Monsignore, per la partecipazione che mi avete fatto dell' alto onore che il Santo Padre si è degnato conferire sulla mia persona; and if I ask your permission to continue my address to you, not in your musical language, but in my own dear mother tongue, it is because in the latter I can better express my feelings on this most gracious announcement which you have brought to me, than if I attempted what is above me. First of all, then, I am led to speak of the wonder and profound gratitude which came upon me, and which is upon me still, at the condescension and love towards me of the Holy Father in singling me out for so immense an honour. It was a great surprise. Such an elevation had never come into my thoughts, and seemed to be out of keeping with all my antecedents. I had passed through many trials, but they were over, and now the end of all things had almost come to me and I was at peace. And was it possible that, after all, I had lived through so many years for this? Nor is it easy to see how I could have borne so great a shock had not the Holy Father resolved on a second condescension towards me, which tempered it, and was to all who heard of it a touching evidence of his kindly and generous nature. He felt for me, and he told me the reasons why he raised me to this high position. His act, said he, was a recognition of my zeal and good services for so many years in the Catholic cause. Moreover, he judged it would give pleasure to English Catholics, and even to Protestant England, if I received some mark of his favour. After such gracious words from his Holiness I should have been insensible and heartless if I had had scruples any longer. This is what he had the kindness to say to me, and what could I want more? In a long course of years I have made many mistakes. I have nothing of that high perfection which belongs to the writings of saints—namely, that error cannot be found in them; but what I trust I may claim throughout all that I have written is this—an honest intention, an absence of private ends, a temper of obedience, a willingness to be corrected, a dread of error, a desire to serve the

Holy Church, and through the Divine mercy, a fair measure of success. And, I rejoice to say, to one great mischief I have from the first opposed myself. For thirty, forty, fifty years I have resisted to the best of my powers the spirit of liberalism in religion. Never did the Holy Church need champions against it more sorely than now, when, alas! it is an error overspreading as a snare the whole earth; and on this great occasion, when it is natural for one who is in my place to look out upon the world and upon the Holy Church as it is and upon her future, it will not, I hope, be considered out of place if I renew the protest against it which I have so often made. Liberalism in religion is the doctrine that there is no positive truth in religion, but that one creed is as good as another, and this is the teaching which is gaining substance and force daily. It is inconsistent with the recognition of any religion as true. It teaches that all are to be tolerated, as all are matters of opinion. Revealed religion is not a truth, but a sentiment and a taste—not an objective fact, not miraculous; and it is the right of each individual to make it say just what strikes his fancy. Devotion is not necessarily founded on faith. Men may go to Protestant churches and to Catholic, may get good from both, and belong to neither. They may fraternize together in spiritual thoughts and feelings without having any views at all of doctrine in common or seeing the need of them. Since, then, religion is so personal a peculiarity and so private a possession, we must of necessity ignore it in the intercourse of man with man. If a man puts on a new religion every morning, what is that to you? It is as impertinent to think about a man's religion as about the management of his family. Religion is in no sense the bond of society. Hitherto the civil power has been Christian. Even in countries separated from the Church, as in my own, the *dictum* was in force when I was young that Christianity was the law of the land. Now everywhere that goodly framework of society, which is the creation of Christianity, is throwing off Christianity. The *dictum* to which I have referred, with a hundred others which followed upon it, is gone or is going everywhere, and by the end of the century, unless the Almighty interferes, it will be forgotten. Hitherto it has been considered that religion alone, with its supernatural sanctions, was strong enough to secure the submission of the mass of the population to law and order. Now, philosophers and politicians are bent on satisfying this problem without the aid of Christianity. Instead of the Church's authority and teaching they would substitute, first of all, a universal and a thoroughly secular education, calculated to bring home to every individual that to be orderly, industrious, and sober is his personal interest. Then, for great working principles

to take the place of religion for the use of the masses thus carefully educated, they provide the broad, fundamental, ethical truths of justice, benevolence, veracity, and the like, proved experience, and those natural laws which exist and act spontaneously in society and in social matters, whether physical or psychological—for instance, in government, trade, finance, sanitary experiments, the intercourse of nations. As to religion, it is a private luxury which a man may have if he will, but which, of course, he must pay for, and which he must not obtrude upon others or indulge to their annoyance. The general character of this great apostasy is one and the same everywhere, but in detail and in character it varies in different countries. For myself, I would rather speak of it in my own country, which I know. There, I think, it threatens to have a formidable success, though it is not easy to see what will be its ultimate issue. At first sight it might be thought that Englishmen are too religious for a movement which on the Continent seems to be founded on infidelity; but the misfortune with us is that, though it ends in infidelity, as in other places, it does not necessarily arise out of infidelity. It must be recollected that the religious sects which sprang up in England three centuries ago, and which are so powerful now, have ever been fiercely opposed to the union of Church and State, and would advocate the un-Christianizing the monarchy and all that belongs to it, under the notion that such a catastrophe would make Christianity much more pure and much more powerful. Next, the liberal principle is forced on us through the necessity of the case. Consider what follows from the very fact of these many sects. They constitute the religion, it is supposed, of half the population; and recollect, our mode of government is popular. Every dozen men taken at random whom you meet in the streets have a share in political power. When you inquire into their forms of belief, perhaps they represent one or other of as many as seven religions. How can they possibly act together in municipal or in national matters if each insists on the recognition of his own religious denomination? All action would be at a deadlock unless the subject of religion were ignored. We cannot help ourselves. And, thirdly, it must be borne in mind that there is much in the liberalistic theory which is good and true; for example, not to say more, the precepts of justice, truthfulness, sobriety, self-command, benevolence, which, as I have already noted, are among its avowed principles. It is not till we find that this array of principle is intended to supersede, to block out religion, that we pronounce it to be evil. There never was a device of the enemy so cleverly framed and with such promise of success. And already it has answered to the expectations which have been formed of it. It is sweeping into its

own ranks great numbers of able, earnest, virtuous men—elderly men of approved antecedents, young men with a career before them. Such is the state of things in England, and it is well that it should be realised by all of us; but it must not be supposed for a moment that I am afraid of it. I lament it deeply, because I foresee that it may be the ruin of many souls; but I have no fear at all that it really can do aught of serious harm to the work of truth, to the Holy Church, to our Almighty King, the Lion of the tribe of Juda, faithful and true, or to His Vicar on earth. Christianity has been too often in what seemed deadly peril that we should fear for it any new trial now. So far is certain. On the other hand, what is uncertain, and in these great contests commonly is uncertain, and what is commonly a great surprise when it is witnessed, is the particular mode in the event by which Providence rescues and saves his elect inheritance. Sometimes our enemy is turned into a friend; sometimes he is despoiled of that special virulence of evil which was so threatening; sometimes he falls to pieces of himself; sometimes he does just so much as is beneficial and then is removed. Commonly the Church has nothing more to do than to go on in her own proper duties in confidence and peace, to stand still, and to see the salvation of God. *Mansueti hereditabunt terram et delectabuntur in multitudine pacis.*"

There are so many circumstances which combine to make the elevation of Cardinal Newman a truly remarkable event, that whatsoever is said here will be necessarily incomplete. That there should be three English Cardinals at one time is unusual, to begin with. That one of them, not being a bishop in administration of a See, should nevertheless live in England; that he should be a Father of the Oratory of S. Philip Neri, and that he should be a convert from Anglicanism; all these aspects of the matter are full of suggestiveness. But the absolutely unparalleled position which has for a long time been held by John Henry Newman in relation to the spiritual and ecclesiastical questions which occupy contemporary thought in England, is such as to make his creation as a Cardinal equivalent to a Papal pronouncement on "30, 40, 50 years" of the religious history of the nineteenth century.

"We have resolved," said the Pope, to the Consistory of May 12th, "to add to your College certain illustrious and esteemed men, who have made themselves perfectly worthy to bear your sublime title, and to wear the insignia of your order; some by their abounding zeal, their prudence, and their skill in pastoral administration, in the care of souls, and in the defence of the doctrines and rights of the Church by published writings and by

the ministry of the Word ; others by their eminent learning and the renown they have acquired in teaching, or by the publication of noble monuments of their genius ; and all by their unshaken faith towards this Apostolic See, by great labours undergone in the cause of the Church, and by the merit of their priestly virtue and constancy, proved in very many ways." *

Cardinal Newman, then, receives his dignity for a series of splendid writings, characterized, as has also been his personal life, by unshaken faith and fidelity to the See of Rome ; by hard work in the cause of the Holy Church ; and by that constancy in virtue without which genius is vain and power a snare. No words could express more pointedly than those of Leo XIII., the broad view which the world, Catholics and non-Catholics alike, will take of the promotion of Cardinal Newman. No sentences could better lift the Catholic mind above ingenious explanations and small secrets. None could more effectually rebuke the persistent attempts, on the part of some non-Catholics, to prove their dreaded scourge to be a " Liberal," a discontented, a disappointed man, a half-Catholic on the verge of turning back to what he had renounced. And no words, perhaps, could better convey to the venerable confessor of the faith, worn-out now by the anxiety and physical strain of a hundred critical fights, the consoling assurance that that Judge in whom calm investigation, simplicity of motive, the light of prayer and the not far-off assistance of the Holy Spirit, combine to make an intellectual daylight which shines for him alone, has received and approved of the labours of his life.

It is difficult to speak of a great man who is yet living ; and that consideration will necessarily make all attempts at an appreciation of the latest English Cardinal much more colourless and measured than they ought to be. But there are men whose names belong to history before themselves have disappeared from the stage of actual work ; and whilst it is the prayer of all of us that the illustrious Oratorian may live many years longer, yet it is impossible to allow an opportunity to go by such as now offers itself, of commenting on a career which will hereafter be cited as an integral part of the history of English Catholicism.

Cardinal Newman's wonderful life offers two aspects for consideration. The first is, his exceptional power and influence over Englishmen of every religious school, but especially over those who in any way own allegiance to the Anglican Church ; and the second is, the special service which, partly on account of that

* *Omnes demum immotâ fide erga hanc Apostolicam Sedem, exantlatis pro Ecclesia laboribus, et egregiis meritis sacerdotalis virtutis et constantiæ, multis argumentis spectatæ et cognitæ.*

influence, and partly by the same gifts to which that influence was owing, he has rendered to the Holy Catholic Faith.

There can be no question that, whatever be the merits of the conflicts and controversies associated with the name of Newman, the root and substance of his influence over his countrymen is his singular gift of speech. It is not easy to analyze an endowment which is in him the embodiment of nothing less than genius. His power of language consists in perfection of form and poetic or imaginative glow. It is a gift which did not spring up mature in a single hour. We can watch it gradually growing and ripening, from the first "Essay on Miracles" to the gem-like finish and white light of his later sermons, and of some portions of the "Apologia." His writings, when they come to be submitted to the tests and analysis of criticism, will be found to present a harmoniously changing series of forms and colours. They offer, in their earliest specimens, great sobriety and even a suspicion of poverty. They are refined in form and simple in expression; but the writer is under the influence of the eighteenth century moralists, and he is cold and a little dry. He reminds us of Locke without Locke's vigour, and his sententiousness is that of Blair and the sermon-writers, or Reid and the common-sense philosophers. But as he grows older, and his thought deepens and his experiences enlarge, the comparatively thin and pale style takes substance and colour. In the sermons of the period of his Oxford days every point of Christian life and ecclesiastical practice is touched, and the heart of a lover of men, warmed by the fancy of a poet, weaves the sober threads of common morality into a web of deep and effective colour. The colour, it may be, is a little too luxuriant, and the imagination less chastened than a preacher's fancy should be. But the Newman of the "Plain and Parochial Sermons," though a poet, does not write what is commonly called poetical prose. On the contrary, he most unmistakably preaches. And whatever was excellent and worthy in his style grew more excellent as he wrote more, while the defects seemed to wane and disappear. His style seems to be no "style." There is nothing to seize upon in its character; no brilliant excess, or splendid fault, or grand eccentricity. Like all first-class writers, Demosthenes, for instance, or Bossuet, or George Eliot, he wears his style like a robe measured to his height and movement as by the ministry of some deity. The form grows yearly more absolute and more pure in outline, because the mental analysis is growing every year more rapid and finished. The colour, which at first both brightens and tinges the thoughts, gradually turns into a whiter light, which pours radiance without interposing any gross foreign atmosphere between the eye and the thought. Thus to read Newman is easy, and it is exila-

rating. It is easy, as nature is easy, and as the eye easily follows the outlines and the colours of hill and plain, trees and water, on a bright morning in summer. It is exhilarating, because there is always exhilaration in the series of slight mental shocks caused by fertile analysis, unexpected comparison, happily-found relation, exactly-hitting epithet, and phrases whose momentum is undiminished by inartistic padding. Such power of attracting he displays, too, on the very largest scale. Genius is in nothing shown so distinctly as in the power of a mind to leap across great chasms, and join together in some novel synthesis ideas which ordinary minds have never compared. This is a power which cannot be acquired. Yet without assiduous study and thought, it is a power which will lie idle for want of solid earth to stand on. It is this combination of far-seeing insight and wide reading which make the historical "views" of Cardinal Newman so new, so interesting, and so inspiring. From the point of view of art, it may, perhaps, be said that he has nowhere succeeded as he has in history. Strange to say, there is no branch of "speech" which calls for originality of view so loudly as history. There are historians who are original at the expense of truth and fact. But the real historic temper is that of him who directs the mental view of the reader to points and combinations and symmetrical arrangements in the completed and monumental facts which he would not have discovered for himself. Such is Newman in history. But he is almost equally great in his analysis of questions half literary and half metaphysical, such as he treats in the "University" series, and in that mingling of wide view, sententious thought, and tender grace with which all the world is familiar in the "Sermons." It is a tempting theme to discuss, the "art of speech" of John Henry Newman. It is certain that it counts for the chief among the forces which make him what he has been and is.

As it always happens, Cardinal Newman partly shaped, partly was shaped, by his circumstances. It was the "Oxford movement" which gave him his power, and placed in his hands the sceptre he still wields; and it need not be said that the Oxford movement was in a great measure the movement and the march of his own mind. Whatever was done by others—true as it may be that Keble contributed the poetry, and Pusey the learning, to the Tractarian revival—Newman was the only one who gave it a voice.

The crowd does not put things together for themselves; and the world might have long endured Dr. Pusey's interminable patristic, and enjoyed Mr. Keble's fanciful Anglicanism, without recognising that they were part of the *Via Media*. But when a voice, clear, definite, and sonorous, was heard in sermon, tract,

letter, and pamphlet, announcing new discoveries, claiming attention to forgotten truths, and directing the minds of readers where to look, and what to look for, then the "movement" began to be personified, and even the careless seeker after news had a mental full-length figure of it ready for practical use. And Newman was fortunate in his audience. Cardinal Newman's audience, now, is the English-speaking public of the world. But it must not be forgotten that there was a long time during which he was read and admired by no more than a party. Indeed, it seems true to say that his general popularity dates only from the day of the "Apologia." But still he was very happy in his first audience. It was his fortune, whilst it was also a duty he clearly recognised, to stand up for antiquity, learning, and ideal holiness, against innovation and neglect; to battle for a "venerable Church," as a son for his mother, or a knight errant for a maiden in distress; to uphold, as a gentleman, a clergyman, and a Tory, that "divine right" of the educated, refined, and easy classes, the denial of which opens the way to revolution and impiety. At Oxford he was listened to by the very best men of England; and by birth and association they naturally listened to him with persuasion and delight. The Liberal party, then just pushing out its horns, was nowhere before him—until he took one step too far. He might have gone to any length in his theories of Church and Sacraments had he but stopped short of Rome. Of course, he could do nothing of the kind; the leaven in his mind had to spread; the tiny seed had to grow to a tree. But the moment it seemed certain that his spoken words (whatever his private views) pointed to friendship with Rome and to reconciliation, then the friends who had cheered him on grew silent (save a few), the authorities of his University condemned him, and the bishops whose office he had so greatly magnified cast every one a stone that was intended to crush him. But he had secured his audience. The men who had been under his spell could never forget him. They who were young in Oxford, in the decade of 1833-43, have either passed away or else they are living in mature age, but they have done more to mould the political, literary, and social life of England during the forty years since elapsed, than any of their contemporaries. And they are the foundation of the reputation of John Henry Newman—the peers, statesmen, country gentlemen, academic teachers, and numberless clergymen who lived in, or joined in, the historic struggle which has changed so much, and—so far—settled so little. Men who were to guide the national voice looked back to early hints and inspirations received some Sunday in S. Mary's; men who were to influence crowds of men, and two or three generations of men, in parishes large and small, had to thank him for more than one

powerful and fertile principle; men who carried on controversy had to devote a chapter or a paragraph to Tract 90; men who in great measure made the best books, the truest histories, the sweetest songs, the most admired and influential novels, the loftiest leading articles, had his name by heart, and also some page of his wide writings, where they had found something which they would not forget. Thus, with an exceptional audience, and with the noblest and deepest of human controversies to argue in, Dr. Newman put the mighty weapon of his speech to the proof, and whilst he himself looked only to the victory of truth, he drew after him by the magic of his word the best minds and hearts of his generation.

And yet, as we have hinted, Dr. Newman was not always "popular" in England. He was not popular in 1841; and he was not popular in 1845; and during the first twenty years of his life as a Catholic he was admired, certainly, by a wide circle, and respected by public writers of every school, but there was a widespread feeling that he was more eloquent, more ingenious, more clever than he was straightforward. In 1865 he wrote as follows:—

It is now more than twenty years that a vague impression to my disadvantage has rested on the popular mind, as if my conduct towards the Anglican Church, when I was a member of it, was inconsistent with Christian simplicity and uprightness. . . . For twenty years and more I have borne an imputation of which I am at least as sensitive, who am the object of it, as they can be, who are only the judges.*

We all know how the reckless imputation of a popular writer of the day gave him an opportunity of dealing with this imputation, and how he used it. The "*Apologia*," a book of "confessions" written with the utmost rapidity, from an overflowing consciousness, and yet as admirable in form and structure as if it had been elaborated during long years, broke down the barriers that kept the crowd of Englishmen at a distance from Dr. Newman. The appeal for fair play, the recital of a story which needed no comment, the genuine accent of truth, were too much for the English people, and they took him to their heart. And now, fourteen years since the "*Apologia*" appeared, there has been given to them a chance of showing what they think of him. It is an occasion not without its complexity. That Newman should be honoured, chimes in with the popular wish. But that Newman should be distrusted and unnoticed by his Church, has also been among the articles of the public faith and hope. Yet the honour and the recognition come in the shape of that exciting

* "*Apologia*," iv. xiii.

red hat of the Roman Cardinalate, which has more than once roused the English mind to a short madness. It went against the grain to be glad that even Newman had been decorated by the Court of Rome. Something was said, no doubt, about new Popes and more liberal measures; but even the British public has been unable to prove to its satisfaction that Leo XIII. is substantially different from Pius IX.; and therefore the honour conferred on the great English leader of thought was inextricably bound up with the fact that he was recognised, by the one authority which knows best, as a most thorough and absolute Catholic. There was no help for it, and the English people must either proclaim John Henry Newman to be at one with the Pope, or hold its tongue and make no sign. The situation, as we know, has been accepted. English opinion has spoken, in every form and manner of which it is capable, if we except what occurs at times of political crisis, and has proclaimed its love for the man, and its trust in his honour and his intentions, and its delight that he has been made a Cardinal.

If the Church of God were a human institution, it would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of the presence in her ranks of such a name and such a force as this. As it is, she depends not on man; and He on whom she does depend makes use, as often as not, of the least, the weakest and the most contemptible means, to extend her empire and strengthen her influence. Still there are from time to time men like S. Paul and S. Augustine—men who have human genius and wordly renown—whose work is certainly not less successful because they are equipped with earthly as well as heavenly weapons.

Taking a human view of the exaltation of the Catholic Church in England and of England's conversion, the most imperative and pressing work to be done has been, and is yet, the removal of public prejudice. It is always deeply mysterious and awe-inspiring to observe how God's might is allowed by Himself to be baffled by a petty obstacle. The abounding grace of the Sacraments depends on the presence of a minister. Our Lord in the Tabernacle will not move to the bed of His dying servant unless there is one to carry Him. Thousands and millions of Pagans continue to die outside of the range—not of the Precious Blood—but of its ordinary means of application, because there is no human voice to reach their simple hearts, and no human hand to lift up the crucifix to their childlike gaze. Many vocations are frustrated, and many souls remain to the end in low and dim regions of the spiritual life for want of a voice or a book. Hundreds of our own countrymen and countrywomen, with every natural preparation for grace, with pure natures, educated intelligence and cultured habits, nay, even with the graces of baptism

or the graces of contrition, remain outside the Church and hostile to the Church; and one cannot help knowing that if they had been born in the Church, or had had a somewhat different bringing up, or had lived in other surroundings, they would have been much more fervent Catholics than we ourselves. And this is true even of masses of the English people, among whom, in many regions of England and Wales, there is a natural earnestness, an inborn reverence for the unseen, and even an emotional worship of God and love of our Lord Jesus Christ, which make one cry out with tears, on noticing their hard repulsion to Catholicism, What noble Catholics these people would make did they but know things as they really are! Yet the grace and the power of God, able to save them and a thousand Englands over and over again, are held back, apparently, by the mean physical circumstance that their souls have had no teacher and no preacher. The beneficent flood that would gladden the desolate land, and make the wilderness rejoice and flourish like the lily, is pent up and restrained by banks and mounds of earthly clay, which a strong man would pierce through in an hour. It must be always so; for the Incarnation has set the law of God's working, and the Saviour of the world must always depend upon His mother and His foster-father, upon His brethren and His apostles, and even upon the movements of His scorers and His enemies. As far as one can see, the greatest service which can be done for the conversion of England is, to lift from her that cloud of prejudice which keeps her from knowing what Catholicism is. Leaving individuals out of the question, if the country is to be converted a generation must first grow which sees a number of things very differently from what they have been, and are, seen. England must be accustomed to the *look* of Catholicism, so as to meet it without shrinking, to catch sight of it without screaming out, to walk round it without spitting upon it. It is not the worship of God, or the love of Jesus Christ, or salvation through His Blood, or the existence of a dignified hierarchy of teachers, or the decent conduct of external worship, that Protestant England objects to; but she is frightened at the things which her tradition has made into scarecrows—Mass, Confession, the Blessed Virgin, the Pope. There is nothing, except the multiplication of prayer, which is so well calculated to give good hope of the future, as the change which has been going on in regard to such matters as these during the last five and twenty years. England is not converted; far from it; it is possible we lose more of our poor people than we gain from heresy. But a wave of preparation is passing over the country. Books, periodicals, and newspapers are not so outrageous as they once were. Public meetings are not as those during the Papal Aggression days. The

numbers of Protestants who attend our Churches in the large towns, and the number of children who are either in contact with our priests, or at least not systematically inoculated with falsehood and hatred, is increasing every year. Dogmatic Protestantism is becoming discredited even too fast, for whilst we have not yet reached the main body of the English people, their religious ideas are breaking up, and they are passing over to unbelief.

Although many venerable names could be mentioned as having taken part in that removal or reversal of the "Protestant tradition," now happily proceeding, no one will doubt for a moment that the one who has done the giant's share of the work is Cardinal Newman. His lectures on Anglican Difficulties, for instance, were delivered a quarter of a century ago. They form, together with those on the "Present Position of Catholics," an era in Catholic controversy. Their exhortations, their explanations, their expostulations, their happy sarcasm, both pleased the public and enlightened it.

But in truth his services to Catholicism in England began long before his conversion. The work of his Oxford days was the elaboration of the portrait of a dogmatic Church. That work, promoted and extended as it has been by his followers inside and outside Catholicism, has ended in placing before the eyes of every Englishman who reads, the majestic figure of the true Church of Christ. It has been a long and a complex labour. S. Augustine, 1200 years ago, simply marched up to the assembly of the men of Kent, singing a Litany and holding aloft the figure of our Redeemer. "The awful form of Catholicism," to use Cardinal Newman's own words, "finds in the Englishman a very different being from the simple Anglo-Saxon to whom it originally came." And to open his eyes it has taken much work during nearly half a century, and will take much more—sermons, lectures, dogmatic treatises, and even popular tales; but everywhere we meet the name of Newman. If one merely looks at a list of subjects, such as is to be found in Mr. Lilly's well-known volume,* some idea may be formed of the enormous number of points connected with the Catholic Church in which Dr. Newman, during thirty or forty years, has enlightened and rectified the ideas of his countrymen. We find, for instance,—*"Faith in the Catholic Church," "Dispositions for Joining the Catholic Church," "A Convert," "Faith and Devotion," "Private Judgment among Catholics," "The Aim of the Catholic Church," "The Religion of Catholics," "The Privileges of Catholics," "Transubstantiation," "Mass," "Benediction," "Confession," "Relics and Miracles,"*

* "Characteristics from the Writings of Cardinal Newman." (Kegan Paul.)

"The Blessed Virgin". (many times over), "The Obligations of Catholics to the Holy See," "Scandals in the Catholic Church," "A Bad Catholic," "The Idea of a Saint;" and, in addition, there are the numerous passages in which he compares the Church with Anglicanism or Protestantism.

He has not only taken a chief part in creating, in English literature, a true portrait of the Church, but he has forced his countrymen to believe that a man may be a Catholic, and yet a reasonable and free being, and a loyal Englishman.

Cardinal Newman holds a very marked and clearly defined position in regard to religious belief. His most distinctly dominant attitude of mind has always been the keen perception of the absolute duty of submitting the intellect to the divinely-protected Church of Christ. In this respect he underwent no intellectual change when he left Anglicanism and became a Catholic.* It was for this truth he contended in his Oxford days—even when he did not recognise the living Church herself. He has always, since his reception, told inquirers that they must "receive (revealed dogma) as it is infallibly interpreted by the authority to whom it is thus committed (the Church), and (implicitly) as it shall be, in like manner, further interpreted by that same authority to the end of time."† To him the Church is the "region of light, the home of peace, the presence of the Saints."‡ "I have been in perfect peace and contentment; I have never had one doubt" (since his reception). He had no trouble "about receiving those additional articles which are not found in the Anglican Creed." "Some of them I believed already, but not any one of them was a trial to me. I made a profession of them at my reception with the greatest ease, and I have the same ease in believing them now."§ We may say, indeed, that the prominent aim and combat of his life has been to present and explain and defend the infallible teaching office of the Church. The principle of submission to authority in matters of religion led him (humanly speaking) to Catholicism, and, so far as a Catholic can be of one spirit rather than another, the same principle informs and moves him still. This ruling *leit-motiv* in Cardinal Newman's life explains his attitude in matters antecedent to faith, and also in matters where the principle of authority, though still present, gradually vanishes, first to a penumbra and then into vacancy. He has rather scorned the Agnostic controversy. It has seemed to him that the belief in a God has no antagonists. Not that all men, or all

* "Apologia," p. 238.

† Ibid., p. 351.

‡ "Discourses to Mixed Congregations," p. 189.

§ "Apologia," p. 238.

Englishmen, believe in God; but that no one of them has ever given such a definite account of his views, his reasons, his substitutes for God, his proposals to supply the space left vacant by the withdrawal of religion, as can be seized or grappled with. It has been the same with him in regard to revelation in general. He has considered it undignified for a Catholic "to commit himself to the work of chasing what might turn out to be phantoms, and, in behalf of some special objections to be ingenious in devising a theory, which, before it was completed, might have to give place to some theory newer still, from the fact that these former objections had already come to nought under the uprising of others." His view has been, and is, that Christians are just now called on to be patient; they may sit still, and God will work; they are to go on, priests preaching and explaining, people acting out Catholicism in their lives; and difficulties will drop down or eat each other up; *mansueti hereditabunt terram*, as he said the other day in Rome. Hence he has given an account of his own belief in God, and in an infallible Church; but he has not argued or controverted with the Agnostics, or the physical science people.

This is, obviously, not the time to speak of what Cardinal Newman has done for his fellow Catholics in regard to matters which concern rather themselves than their non-Catholic countrymen. He is not dead yet. May that day be very far away! But let us notice one or two facts that lie on the surface. First of all, he has shown us how to Catholicize our national tongue. Catholicism is "universal" in time and in locality; and when she puts on the temporary dress of a vernacular tongue, either she forces it into her own moulds, or else, if the native tongue is too strong, she must adapt her forms to its genius; and as her first concern is with her own dogma and practice, such adaptation is sometimes roughly done and repellent. The English language is a strong and deeply-rooted tree of human speech. When it was growing, three hundred years ago, into what it is now, happily old Catholic memories were still alive to mould it and to impregnate it with their odour. Yet during that three hundred years the English tongue has grown very unfamiliar with Catholic exposition and Catholic prayer. When the English Catholic wrote, he wrote in France or in Belgium; when he preached to English ears his sermon was often too nearly akin to French idiom, or too stiff with Latinized phrases to claim citizenship on English soil. The deficiency was not keenly felt until within living memory. Up to the day of the railway and the cheap newspaper, we perhaps held our own. The two Butlers, Bishop Challoner, Bishop Milner, and, most remarkable of all, Dr Lingard, wrote as good English as all but the foremost of their

respective contemporaries. But rapid communication and cheap printing has given, by an easily understood process, a stimulus to literary style such as it never had since the invention of printing. A leading article in the *Times* or the *Spectator* is now as mechanically perfect as a page of Gibbon. The trick and turn of a great writer is spread over the whole field of literature in a year or two; and a single powerful genius will within that period distinctly raise the general level of literary excellence. Two of our foremost writers and speakers among born Catholics during the last forty (not to mention any still living) years have been Bishop Baines and Cardinal Wiseman. Bishop Baines was a man of deep, earnest thought and eloquent expression; Cardinal Wiseman was one of those masculine and powerful minds, whose achievements satisfy the reader because the writer has first honestly satisfied himself; but neither of them could have conceived the "Second Spring," or "Loss and Gain," or the letter to Dr. Pusey. Not that Cardinal Wiseman has not left us undying pages of touching exhortation, of powerful apologetic, of fancy, and of patristic exposition. But the difference is still most striking; it is not a difference in degree, but in kind; it is the difference between Giotto and Raffaele; between Handel and Beethoven. There are many amongst us at this moment—chiefly, no doubt, the Oxford converts—who treat Catholic dogma and exhortation in a pure style of modern English. But it will not be denied that Cardinal Newman has taken the lead here again. He has given us dogmatic theology in English (as in the theological pages of the "Grammar of Assent"), moral theology in English, devotion in English, most genuinely English sermons, Church History in a fashion which would make one say that English is the native tongue of Socrates and Eusebius, of Chrysostom and Basil, and most frankly English polemical exercises, which sparkle as pleasantly to the eye, and go as keenly to the mark, as any literary criticism of the day. The more one reads him the more one feels that there are few regions of Catholic thought, from the most technical divinity down to a simple prayer of pious ejaculation, which his great gift of speech has not taken possession of. The advantage which he, and those like him, have thus put into our hands is like the gift of new steel rails of the latest make; or of the most modern fluid-compressed steel projectiles; the substance of English Catholic speech is indefinitely more true, more steady, more lasting, and more effective.

It is a subject of regret that Cardinal Newman has yet given us comparatively so little of what we may call elaborate uncontroversial exposition of Catholic doctrine. The presentment of God's holy truth, calmly, strongly, and beautifully laid

before the heart, without the hurry of periodical writing, or the heat of controversy, is one of the most powerful means of strengthening faith. Cardinal Newman has given us grand pages and chapters of such exposition; but we long for treatises. It has been through no fault of his that he has not done more. He has generally written for the occasion. He has had over and over again to leave off building the walls of Sion, in order to sally out against some Sanaballat and his marauders. Therefore, for what we have we are grateful.

Speaking for the born-Catholics of a generation now no longer young, we can say with affectionate sincerity, that they have grown up and thriven on the writings of John Henry Newman; their early years were brightened by his genius, their hearts were stirred in youth by his pictures of the majesty and holiness of God's Kingdom, their mature studies have been illumined by his far-reaching thought, and they have looked up to him—and do now more than ever look up to him—as a leader and a father. They have not always quite agreed with a phrase or a paragraph; they have been aware, as by some subtle instinct, that the great Oratorian has feelings as quick as his intellect is deep; they have felt that occasionally nerves and antipathies have become articulate, and judgment been overlooked. Yet these very signs are valuable, as proving that his whole life and mind are in his writings; and that what he says he does not say through any policy or purely external pressure, but because he truly *is* to the very bottom what he utters. He has lived and waited as a Catholic now for over thirty years. He did not know that he was waiting for anything except the coming of his Redeemer, and perhaps the tardy reparation by his countrymen of some of their misjudgments. In the true spirit of S. Philip, he sat at home. Men sought him out; every Oratorian expects to be sought. The home of the spirit which he made for those who sought him has been a home in more senses than even S. Philip's houses usually are. How many have found his Oratory the porch and threshold of God's earthly and heavenly Kingdom! In his quiet home the word of Leo XIII. found him, and called him, as another Pope found and called Baronius. Those who have known him near at hand, and those whose eyes have followed him from afar—his friends, his children, and his disciples—the Church at home and abroad, and Englishmen everywhere—are glad that honour has sought out one whom in so many ways they have learnt to prize for his genius and to love for himself.

Science Notices.

The Telephone.—Among the recent discoveries in science the loud-speaking Telephone of Mr. Edison deserves something more than a passing notice. If the invention at all realises its early promise, we may confidently predict that we are upon the eve of a revolution in telegraphy.

The principle on which the instrument is founded is quite a new one, and, in fact, so far inexplicable to science. It was, it seems owing to the accident of holding his finger against the stylus of a Morse instrument that Mr. Edison was led to notice it. An easy experiment will explain better than anything else the principle in question. A metallic plate is connected with a battery, and a flat stylus, similarly connected, is arranged to press gently on the plate. A piece of blotting-paper, damped with a solution of caustic potash, is now laid upon the plate beneath the stylus. It will be obvious that if the plate be drawn beneath the stylus a certain amount of resistance will be encountered, owing to the friction set up between the paper and the stylus. But directly the battery is connected, it will be found that all frictional resistance will vanish, and the stylus move over the blotting-paper as if the latter were the smoothest of known substances.

No one as yet has succeeded in giving a satisfactory explanation of this phenomenon. It is surmised that it must have its origin in molecular changes, as yet rather obscure, to which, however, Mr. Crookes is now drawing attention, and which seem to promise us startling revelations into the world of matter. Mr. Edison has, in the meantime, taken advantage of the fact to construct his telephone on this principle; and all who have heard it agree in representing its performance as not only highly successful, but little short of marvellous.

The instrument consists of a box about eight inches square. A diaphragm, preferably of mica, some four inches in diameter, is let into one of the sides. To the centre of this piece of mica a strip of metal is attached by one of its ends; the farther or free end plays on a little cylinder of chalk, which is capable of being set in rotation by the hand. The chalk, which is impregnated with a solution of sulphate of soda, is kept moist by mechanical arrangements. The action is not difficult to follow. The chalk cylinder is set in rotation by the hand and establishes a certain amount of friction between itself and the strip of metal; the effect of this, of course, will be to pull in the centre of the mica diaphragm, which then assumes a concave shape on the side turned to the spectator. So far the movements are purely mechanical and simple. The electric action, however, sets in as soon as the voice at the transmitting end throws the plate of mica at that end into vibration. These vibrations cause a current of electricity to pass along

the wire and into the chalk cylinder; in an instant the friction is destroyed, and the concave mica plate springs back released from the friction on the cylinder. And as a series of vibrations are given to the mica at the transmitting end, a series of rapidly changing electric waves are passed on to the mica at the speaking end which thus faithfully represents every motion impressed upon the transmitting plate. Thus, if we were to sound the note middle C at the transmitting end we should imprint 264 vibrations on the mica plate, consequently there would be 264 electric currents started, and 264 slips of the metal which would produce the note C at the distant station. It has been suggested as a probable explanation of the reproduction of the sound that the rotating cylinder acts on the spring attached to the mica like a resined bow on a violin string; vibrations are set up whose extent, manner, and rate are modified by the varying friction due to the current.

It is fair to state, in justice to Mr. Edison, that we have as yet seen but an imperfect performance of his instrument. The telephone now on exhibition was hastily put together at the urgent request of Col. Gouraud—Mr. Edison's London representative; new and more complete receivers will be sent over shortly, previous to their general introduction into this country.

The Electric Light.—The sudden subsidence of the excitement on the subject of the electric light has long been foreseen, but it was hardly expected to occur so soon. There can be no doubt that the original impetus was given to the movement by the introduction of the Jablochkoff "electric candle" in the Avenue de l'Opéra, in Paris. Closely following upon this came the startling announcement from America that Mr. Edison had succeeded in dividing the electric light. A panic set in among the holders of gas shares, and in America, at least, the shares touched so low a point that the alarmists must have suffered considerably.

It is not the first time that the public mind has been aroused by startling announcements in connection with electric lighting. As far back as 1845, Mr. King, of London, took out a patent for electric lighting by means of the incandescence of platinum. Other inventors for platinum have substituted iridium, a metal which has a very high fusing point; and the latest advices from America state that Mr. Edison, in his reported discovery, has had recourse to iridium as a source of light.

There are formidable difficulties in the use of any metal in the poles of the electric arc. The incandescence is produced by the specific resistance of the metal which the current encounters in its path. Now the points of metallic incandescence and fusion are, so to speak, such close neighbours, that one can hardly be excited without affecting the other; *Tua res agitur paries cum proximus ardet*. It will, therefore, require a very delicate adjustment of the current to produce just enough heat to make the metal glow, but not melt. In fact, the difficulties in the way of effecting this result have been so

serious as to lead to the general substitution of carbon conductors, which are not readily fused or volatilized. For many years nothing more was heard upon the subject. In 1876 fresh interest in the question revived, when M. Jablochhoff, an officer in the Russian army, brought forward his arrangement, generally known as the "electric candle." Instead of placing the carbon points one above the other, as in all previous arrangements, he placed them side by side, with some insulating material between, so that they might be mechanically in contact, but electrically separated. A temporary connection is made at the outset by uniting the two carbon rods at the top, but once the arc is established it will continue to play without interruption until the carbon is exhausted. There are many ingenious details in this invention for regulating the wearing away of the two rods, but they are of so technical a nature that space will not allow us to notice them.

The electric lighting of the streets of Paris which has lately attracted so much attention was effected by the Jablochhoff candle. The long rows of white houses which are so distinguishing a feature of Paris have added not a little to the effect by forming an admirable background, while the eye is caught by numerous points of brilliant light. The effect in the judgment of even the most prejudiced was very striking. It may be owing to the absence of some reflecting background that the Jablochhoff candle succeeded so badly on the Victoria Embankment in London. Its failure was even greater in Billingsgate Market; the unfortunate fishmongers were unable to detect the shades of colour on their fish, while a curious complaint was heard on all sides that the new light was so cold!

Mr. Werderman has recently patented a form of lamp in which the carbon points are not separated, as in other arrangements, but by suitable mechanical device kept in immediate contact. The inventor claims as the special features in his lamp, the low electro-motive power required, while the light is of so soft a character that it appears unnecessary to protect it by globes of opaque glass.

Messrs. Ladd & Co. have recently exhibited at the Liverpool Street Station a form of lamp known after the name of its inventor, Mr. Wallace, of Connecticut. It differs from all others in the use of large rectangular slabs of carbon instead of thin rods. As soon as the current is connected, an electro-magnet is brought into action which pulls the two slabs just sufficiently asunder to allow the arc to play. The light is produced in the ordinary way, but as the positive pole at any particular point wears away, the separation between the slabs becomes too great for the arc to play—a connection is consequently set up with the neighbouring part of the positive carbon, and the light is continued without interruption. In this manner the luminous arc traverses the whole length of the slab, until it reaches the end, when it makes a turn and pursues its course in the opposite direction with the same result. It is clear that by this arrangement the light can be maintained for a considerable time without requiring attendance or change of carbon. In fact, it is maintained by the

exhibitors that their lamps have been known to last for over a hundred hours.

No inventor, however, has as yet succeeded in bringing forward an electric light suitable for domestic purposes. The light so far produced is too brilliant, too costly, and too wasteful of electro-motive power for anything but large spaces or buildings. Nothing but a moderately brilliant light, cheap and simple in its working, can ever hope to supersede gas in our homes. Should the fortunate discoverer arise who shall succeed in dividing the electric light, the advantages of electric lighting are so great, in cleanliness, in security from danger, in healthiness, that they must lead to its general adoption.

BOOKS ON SCIENCE.

The Evolution of Man. From the German of ERNST HAECKEL.
London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

THIS is a work well adapted for what is its evident purpose. Its purpose is to propagate amongst those interested in Natural History, but devoid of special scientific knowledge, a persuasion that Mr. Darwin's view as to our origin is a demonstrable truth, and that Christianity is a fable, and even theism a dream, from which science must awaken us.

The author gives a readable, interesting, and, on the whole, substantially accurate account of such parts of the animal kingdom as enter into what he regards as our genealogical table, beginning with the lowest unicellular organisms and thence passing by sponges, various worms, the ascidians, the amphioxus, sharks, amphibians, and beasts through monkeys up to man.

Especially interesting and instructive is his account of the processes of development which take place in different kinds of animals. This is very clearly given and is exceedingly well illustrated. A discovery of these processes is the most recent acquisition of biological science, and is one yet far from complete, though great advances have been made. It has long been known that the matter of the fertilized egg undergoes a process of spontaneous subdivision or yolk-cleavage, but it has only of late been discovered that the subdivided portions (whether equal or unequal in size) sooner or later arrange themselves in a double layer, called a *gastrula*, and which may be cup-shaped or discoidal.

Professor Haeckel, in the first place, divides animals (from this point of view) into (A) those in which the whole of the yolk undergoes segmentation (as is the case *e.g.* in frogs and beasts) and (B) those in which only a part so divides (as in the fowl's egg), the rest being known as the "nutritive yolk." He further subdivides section A into those in which the yolk divides into equal portions, and those in which its divisions are unequal. Section B he subdivides into those in which the partial segmentation takes place at one portion of the sur-

face of the yolk only, and those in which it takes place superficially over the whole circumference.

His statements as to the conditions presented by different groups of animals, in this respect, may be tabulated as follows:—a list which we feel may be welcome and useful to such of our readers as may take interest in zoology.

Complete yolk cleavage.	{	Equal cleavage —a cup-shaped gastrula.	{	a. Most <i>Cœlentera</i> (low <i>Sponges</i> , <i>Hydropolyps</i> , <i>Medusæ</i> , <i>Corals</i>).
				b. <i>Sagitta</i> , <i>Phoronis</i> , <i>Ascidia</i> , many <i>Neuratodes</i> .
		Unequal cleavage —a hood-shaped gastrula.	{	c. <i>Terebratula</i> , <i>Argiope</i> , <i>Pisidium</i> .
				d. Most <i>Echinoderma</i> .
Partial yolk cleavage.	{	Discoidal cleavage —a disk-shaped gastrula.	{	e. A few <i>Arthropods</i> (e.g., <i>Branchiopods</i> , <i>Copepods</i> , <i>Tardigrades</i>).
				f. <i>Amphioxus</i> .
		Superficial cleavage —a bladder-like gastrula.	{	a. Many <i>Sponges</i> , <i>Medusæ</i> , and <i>Corals</i> , <i>Siphonophores</i> , <i>Ctenophoræ</i> .
				b. Most <i>Worms</i> .
			{	c. Most <i>Mollusca</i> .
			{	d. Individual <i>Echinoderms</i> .
			{	e. A few low <i>Arthropods</i> .
			{	f. <i>Cyclostomes</i> , <i>Ganoids</i> , <i>Amphibia</i> , <i>Mammals</i> .
			{	a. <i>Cephalopoda</i> .
			{	b. Some <i>Arthropods</i> (e.g., <i>Milipedes</i> , <i>Scorpions</i>).
			{	c. <i>Selachii</i> , <i>Teleostei</i> , <i>Reptiles</i> , <i>Birds</i> (and <i>Monotremes</i> ?).
			{	a. A few <i>Sponges</i> ? <i>Alcyonium</i> ?
			{	b. Individual kinds of <i>Worms</i> .
			{	c. Most <i>Arthropods</i> , of all classes.

As we have said, though the work is a clear and able exposition of facts, they are so presented, *ad captandam vulgus*, as to lead the unwary to conclude that they demonstrate the truth of the author's conclusions—which, it need hardly be said, they are very far from doing. But in addition to a skilful marshalling of facts, he treats us to a variety of fictions—many animals being spoken of by him as real, which have absolutely no other evidence for their being than their being needed to support the Darwinian theory as to man. Mere speculations and assumptions are often presented in the guise of ascertained truths. As an example of a piece of romance of this kind the following passage (from vol ii. p. 116) may be taken:—

It was undoubtedly a branch of the Primitive Fishes (*Selachii*) which during the Devonian Period made the first successful effort to accustom itself to terrestrial life, and to breathe atmospheric air. In this the swimming-bladder was especially of service, for it succeeded in adapting itself to respiration of air, and so became a lung. The immediate consequence of this was the modification of the heart and nose.

Sometimes positive errors are to be detected; thus, he says (vol. ii. p. 130) that such *Axolotes* as transform themselves into the *Amblystoma* condition “become sexually mature,” whereas, in fact, the sexual

glands atrophy when this apparently adult form of life is attained to. Again, he says (vol. ii. p. 161), that some of the short-footed semi-apes "approach very near to true apes," which is a statement the reverse of the fact. Again (vol. i. p. 349), he tells us that "the earliest primitive vertebræ . . . are the first and second neck vertebræ, then come the third and fourth, and so on." Such, however, is not the case. The neck vertebræ are not formed from before backwards, but are an intercalation—the middle ones coming last.

Occasionally he ventures on statements which he must know are untrue. Thus he affirms (vol. ii. p. 170) that "many tribes among the lower races of men, especially many negro tribes, use the foot in the same way as the hand. In consequence of early habit and continued practice they are able to grasp as well with the foot as with the hand." Now the author, as an accomplished anatomist, *must* well know that no man of any race opposes the great-toe to the other digits as he opposes the thumb to the fingers, or as the gorilla and all other apes and half-apes oppose the great-toe to the other digits of the foot. The foot-grasping which some men effect is performed in another way, and in no case can they "grasp as well with the foot as with the hand."

The antitheistic animus of Professor Haeckel appears again and again. No one with any natural knowledge could suppose that the small wing of the apteryx or the hidden teeth of young whales can be any inconvenience to those animals. Yet, speaking of such "rudimentary organs," he permits himself to say (vol. ii. p. 439) that but for evolution "it would be impossible to understand why the Creator should have laid this useless burden on his creatures in their life-journey, so arduous at the best."

His anti-Christian prejudice sometimes rises to a degree of absurdity truly sublime—as when he claims "the devoutest reverence" for the little worm-like fish, the lancelet or *amphioxus*. He tells us (vol. i. p. 464) "the amphioxus (skull-less, brainless, and memberless as it is) deserves all respect as being our own flesh and blood! At any rate, the amphioxus has better right to be an object of profoundest admiration and of devoutest reverence than any one in that worthless rabble of so-called 'saints,' in whose honour our 'civilized' and 'enlightened,' cultured nations erect temples and decree processions."

The amount of freedom which Christians might hope to enjoy under the rule of "Liberals,"—save the mark!—such as Professor Haeckel, he makes sufficiently evident. In his preface (p. xxii.) he laments that "the State" yet "permits" the existence of "celibacy" (!), but consoles himself by the charitable and truly liberal reflection: "We do, indeed, now enjoy the unusual pleasure of seeing 'most Christian bishops and Jesuits, exiled and imprisoned for their disobedience to the laws of the State.'" Comment on this passage would be superfluous.

From one point of view his hostility to Christianity is less blameworthy on account of his ignorance of it, though from another he is specially guilty for not taking the trouble to make himself acquainted

with the tenets of those upon whom he does not scruple to call down the sword of persecution.

One or two instances may suffice to demonstrate this culpable ignorance. He has evidently heard that according to our doctrine man has been made in God's image and likeness, but he has never taken the trouble to inquire in what this likeness consists. Had he done so he could never have written the following lines:—"There are many persons who believe that the 'image of God' is unmistakably reflected in their own features. If the nosed-ape shared in this singular opinion, he would hold it with a better right than some snub-nosed persons" (vol. i. p. 374).

The Immaculate Conception of Our Blessed Lady comes in, as might perhaps be anticipated, for an ignorant sneer. He tells us (vol. i. p. 170), "among Vertebrates, 'Virginal generation' never occurs. This we must explicitly affirm in the face of the celebrated dogma of the Immaculate Conception"!

Again, he utterly misconceives the teaching of the Church as to the soul and the body and the separable distinctness of the former, confounding in his ignorant dogmatism the "Mind" with the "Soul!" He speaks of (vol. ii. p. 451) the dualistic view "which denies the inseparable connection of the brain and the mind and regards body and mind as entirely separate and distinct." Apparently he never heard that the "Mind" is the rational soul acting intellectually while united with the body.

But it is not only confident assertion based upon ignorance in religious matters which merits note. Hardly less noteworthy is the mode in which Professor Haeckel, like so many of his school, makes mere words and phrases do duty as an explanation of phenomena when the only other possible explanation is one which the dogmas of their narrow sect forbid them to employ. Thus he makes the word "Adaptation" serve as an explanation, and what it denotes, as a *vera causa* of whole groups of phenomena. He lays down (vol. i. p. 158) the following remarkable dictum:—"Adaptation, the most important vital function, is directly connected with nutrition, and plays the most important part in the progressive development of the organism. It is in reality the most influential cause (!) of every advance and of all perfection of the organism. Adaptation effects all the modifications or variations which organic forms undergo under the influence of the external conditions of existence; it is the true cause (!) of every modification."

In a similar way he regards (vol. i. p. 169) the operation of "a change in the nutrition of the tissue" at the point of the bone of the forehead in a four-horned goat as "an explanation" of the phenomenon. But what requires explanation is that very local change in the nutritive processes which this most shallow philosopher regards as itself an explanation.

With such views it is hardly necessary to say that Professor Haeckel displays the most utter ignorance of psychology, and has not even the perception of what needs to be proved psychologically in order to establish his account of the origin of man. It has rarely been our lot

to encounter a book so redolent of self-satisfied ignorance and arrogant contempt for views which lie beyond the horizon of the writer's mental vision. This man abuses religion without taking the trouble to acquire the most ordinary information concerning it, confounds the "Soul" with the "Mind," takes no note of man's power of abstraction; but with ridiculous dogmatism decries others whilst palming on the readers mere empty phrases like "adaptation," as *veræ causæ*, and as sufficient explanation of the more varied phenomena which the active worlds of vegetable and animal life ceaselessly present to our loving and reverent admiration.

—

O.

Final Causes. By PAUL JANET. Translated from the French, by WILLIAM AFFLECK, B.D. T. T. Clark, Edinburgh.

THE work of M. Paul Janet on "Final Causes," recently translated by William Affleck, B.D., seems to have won for its author the greatest honour in his own country for its universally acknowledged ability and thoroughness, and bids fair to be considered the standard work of our times on the argument of Design. We heartily recommend it to the perusal of such as have had the misfortune to be unsettled by the infidel *physics* of the day.

The writer combines the advantage of a knowledge of physical and metaphysical science—a qualification as valuable as it is rare—and, without expressly aiming at it, makes the reader understand how it is possible that a student of Nature could ever be tempted to be an atheist. The account is, the *warp of the mind exercised only in the one point of view*; and the remedy is the other point of view—*Final Causes*.

A Final Cause is that which in the work as it exists is *effect*, but, in the mind of the contriver of the work is the end (*finis*) intended by him, was the motive which induced him to work at all; and, in this sense, the cause of the work—*e.g.*, the end or purpose of cutting, is the cause of the knife, the trituration of the food, the cause of the molar teeth. But then, it has been said, given the efficient cause or causes, the work would be produced just the same, though the end had not been intended; thus, a steel blade of graduated tenuity would still cut, though that effect had not been intended by the maker, and, given the construction of the molar teeth, they would equally grind, though they had not been designed for grinding.

Now, in the workmanship of man, that there are final causes is an indisputable fact: but are there final causes in Nature? Will you say, in short, that the bird flies because it has wings, or that it has wings in order that it may fly? Doubtless the reader will see no incompatibility in the two statements, and will answer, with M. Janet, that both are true; but the reasons for the former and the latter statement are somewhat different. That birds fly because they have wings, rests on the law of causation, but that they have wings in order that they may fly, rests on a principle which applies the law of causation not only to the phenomena themselves, but to the *order* of the pheno-

mena; since the order of the phenomena equally postulates a cause as the phenomena themselves. He who does not see this distinction, but thinks that he has exhausted the principle of causation, when he has simply registered the facts, and assigned them to their respective physical cause or causes, reminds the author of a man, instanced by Gassendi, who hearing the clock strike four, and being half-asleep, exclaimed, "That clock has gone mad: it has struck one o'clock four times over!" The man was awake to the *sound*, and to the *cause*, but asleep to the significance of the *group*.

The anecdote is very applicable to a certain class of thinkers (?) who conceive that they want no divine idea to account for the works of Nature, just because they have the laws and the facts. There are the organs that conspire to form the organism, the tissues that compose the organs, the cells that compose the tissues; what do you want with design? As who should say: "Look at that piano"—(the simile is M. Janet's)—"Do you think it was contrived to subserve the musician's art? Be assured that that is a superficial and quite popular explanation. Strings, wood, ivory—these are its anatomical elements, and each of these elements has essential and immanent properties. Thus, the strings have the property of vibration, the wood that of resonance, and so forth. What wonder, then, if the machine should serve for the production of musical sound, *since the elements which compose it have the properties necessary to produce that effect!*

If this in truth be the method of physical science, and not a caricature, and, if it rest there, if it do not invoke a natural metaphysic to its aid—for we all of us think and talk metaphysics oftentimes without knowing it)—why, preferable surely is the *indocta ignorantia* of Sganarelle, who thus speaks, as M. Janet cites him, to the unbelieving Don Juan: "I have not studied like you, thank God, and no one could ever boast of having taught me anything; but, with my small sense—with my small judgment—I see things better than books, and understand very well that this world that we see is not a mushroom that has come of itself in a night. I would ask you *who* has made these trees, these rocks, this earth, and yonder sky above? and whether all that has made itself? . . . Can you see all the inventions of which the human machine is composed, without admiring the way in which it is arranged one part with another? these nerves, bones, veins, arteries, these lungs, this heart, this liver? . . . My reasoning is that there is something wonderful in man, whatever you may say, which all the *savants* cannot explain."*

It would far exceed the limits of a notice like the present to give even a sketch of the application of the theory to its final proof of the existence of a supra-mundane Deity; we have merely considered the fundamental principle on which the argument is based, which, suffice it to say, is illustrated and defended with an ability and learning which must command the reader's admiration; though, in so large a work, it is unlikely that every detail will meet with equal approval. We trust it will do good in the quarter where it is needed.

* "Le Festin de Pierre," act iii. scene i. (cited p. 321).

The translation is idiomatic, in general, and one is rarely reminded that it is a translation. But the *shalls* and *wills*, *woulds* and *shoulds*, are respectively interchanged, *passim*; the almost obsolete verb *behave* is used nearly everywhere for *must*, and as a verb personal; while the odd looking participle "awanting" is of far too frequent occurrence. May we hope that these defects will disappear in a future edition?

The Freedom of Science in the Modern State. By RUDOLF VIRCHOW, M.D.
Translated from the German, and Revised by the Author. 2nd
edit. London: John Murray, 1878.

Un-science, not Science, adverse to Faith. A Sermon by the Rev.
E. B. PUSEY, D.D. Oxford: Parker, 1878.

THE lecture by Dr. Virchow, which made some noise after its delivery, before a meeting of Naturalists, at Munich, on September 22nd of last year, is mainly a protest against the attempt to introduce atheistic and materialist theories into education under the name of truth and science. Dr. Rudolph Virchow is a man of European eminence as a physician, a lecturer on medicine, and a discoverer in pathology and physiology. The theory most widely connected with his name is that of the "cellular hypothesis" in pathology—that every cell is derived from a cell, a theory which its author would apply, apparently, throughout the whole organic kingdom. Virchow is a politician and a literary man as well as a professor. In the former capacity he was once challenged to a duel by Count von Bismarck. In the latter he has printed a lecture, in which such "aggressive" scientists as Hückel, Nägeli, and Klebs are roundly and ably called to account. He is not, certainly, a champion of orthodoxy; but he seems to have kept much of his common sense, even if he has shifted away further and further, like Professor Tyndall, from the poor anchorage where he found himself moored when he opened his eyes on this perplexing scene. Dr. Hückel, whose province it is to out-Darwin Mr. Darwin himself, seems to have read a paper at the meeting of the German Association of Naturalists and Physicists above alluded to, in which he insisted that protoplasm explained life and thought, and abolished the idea of God; and he declared that nothing would satisfy him until that great truth was *taught in every school in the land*. It was to protest against this that Dr. Virchow, at the same meeting, delivered extemporaneously the address, the English translation of which is now before us. To most of us the fact that it was delivered at all is the most interesting thing about it. But it is instructive also to observe how far Virchow goes, and where he draws the line. He expresses in very forcible language the absurdity and unreasonableness of the demand to introduce into the education of the young a theory which its own supporters confess to be unproved, and hardly capable of proof. He says very truly that the teaching of the Protoplasmic Soul (*die Plastidul-Seele*) would be equivalent to a new revelation and a new religion. But he is prepared to anticipate a considerable revolution in current thought and in education from the gradual advance of science. He will not say that, some

day or other, it may not be possible to bring psychical processes into an immediate connection with those which are physical—that is, to show that thought and will and morality are “secretions,” or atomic changes. He would not be astonished if it were one day proved that man was developed from the ape, or from some other “point” in the vertebrate kingdom. He does not even reject the *Plastidul-Seele* as impossible of demonstration, though he evidently regards with repressed scorn the wild war-whoops of Hückel, who cuts and bruises himself like any priest of Baal in calling upon the god which he has made up out of “Carbon and Company.” Thus, Dr. Virchow is as remote as it is possible for a man to be from the principle of Christian belief, or from sound mental and spiritual philosophy; and we must use his words as we would use the words of an antagonist, to stop the mouths of those who believe in him, and would go still further than he goes.

From this point of view many of his admissions are useful. He considers it to be beyond all doubt that what he calls “psychical” phenomena, or what are generally called intellectual operations, exist only in the higher animals, and “only with full certainty in the highest.” And he enters his decided protest against the attempt to set up what he calls a *possible* connection as a *doctrine* of science. He claims to be making, at this moment, a special study of Anthropology, and what he says on this head will, therefore, have very great weight. “I am bound to declare,” he says, “that every positive advance which we have made in the province of pre-historic anthropology has actually removed us further from the proof” of a connection between man and the lower animals. The existence of man in the Tertiary period, he says, is still a problem. He can be proved to have existed in the Quaternary; but no advance or development in man has taken place since that time. When we study the fossil man of the Quaternary period, “we always find a man just as men are now.” “There is a complete absence of any fossil type of a lower stage in the development of man.” He maintains that there are relatively more low-typed men now than there are found among the fossils. Perhaps it is only the geniuses of the Quaternary period that have been preserved! As to our connection with the Ape, “not a single fossil skull of an ape or of an ape-man has yet been found that could really have belonged to a human being.” And he concludes: “We cannot teach, we cannot pronounce it to be a conquest of science, that man descends from the Ape or from any other animal.” Perhaps these protests from the mouth of an eminent authority will do something towards teaching the younger generation the virtue of modesty. If theory was always labelled as theory, and speculation described by its proper name, half of the “conflict” between science and religion would never occur. Whilst Mr. Darwin himself admits that his Evolution theory is not proved, and Professor Tyndall confesses that it is probable we shall never fill up all the gaps in it, whoever holds it should hold it as a theory, and modify it so as to fit facts which *are* proved and certain—the facts of the Christian revelation.

The sermon written by Dr. Pusey, and delivered for him by Canon

Liddon at Oxford, aims at showing that true Science cannot contradict Revelation. It is only when Science steps out of its provinces and theorizes on matters which go beyond experience—in a word when it becomes “Un-science,”—that it can come across Theology. The author has accumulated an immense mass of citations, which will, perhaps, prove useful to students. The sermon, however, is not very clear or pointed. The style of a sermon, with its interrogative rhetoric and its pious solemnity, is not exactly fitted for the discussion of Darwin’s views about species, or Hückel’s pedigree of protoplasm. One wants exact theology, intelligible philosophy, and definite admissions of denials. Dr. Pusey knows so much, that he can only exhibit a comparatively small number of specimens of his wealth of knowledge; but it often happens that what he puts forth to the world is a collection without a key or a catalogue—the *nexus* which makes them an orderly whole (if such a *nexus* exists) being kept hidden in his mind. The impression left, however, after reading this sermon—(in which, we may mention, Dr. Virchow’s Address is several times quoted)—is that, in Dr. Pusey’s opinion, Science is very rash in its dogmatism, and that there are many reasons for believing in the existence of God and of a spiritual human soul. Some of the younger members of the University, who heard the Sermon, seem to have asked the author whether he accounted the *animal* derivation of the *body* of man to be a theory contradictory to Revelation, and would, on theological grounds, hold it to be impossible that Science could establish it. His answer is this: “If Science could prove that our race was born of an ape-mother, one should (would?) be forced to the belief, that God took away at once all the propensities which it had by ‘the law of inheritance,’ and gave it a soul, made in His own likeness; but . . . that mythological part of Darwinism must continue to be only a theory . . . and cannot become a Science.”

Education as a Science. By ALEXANDER BAIN, LL.D. (International Scientific Series). London: C. Kegan Paul and Co., 1878.

Education, Intellectual, Moral, and Physical. By HERBERT SPENCER. Cheap edition. London: Williams and Norgate, 1878.

Lettres sur l'Education des Filles. Par Mgr. DUPANLOUP, Evêque d'Orleans. Paris: Jules Gervais, 1879.

THE old definition of a science used to be the knowledge of a subject by its causes; which is to say, an orderly exposition of the philosophical laws of any branch of human inquiry, resting on some law practically ultimate. Therefore, a scientific treatise on education involves a definition of education. You cannot define education by a mere exposition of facts connected with mind and body, heart and brain.

What is the use of saying that education is “the harmonious and equable evolution of the human powers”—which is the definition given by the founders of the Prussian national system—unless you

first understand what is the "harmony" and the "equability" among them which you are to aim at? James Mill, in the "Encyclopædia Britannica," laid down the end of education to be (as Professor Bain quotes him) "to render the individual, as much as possible, an instrument of happiness, first to himself and next to other beings." But what is happiness? Who has a right to prescribe to a child the way in which he ought to be happy? The younger Mill talks about the "perfection of our nature." But that, again, raises a bottomless question—to him and his school. Professor Bain fairly gives up the search for a definition of education, and thinks he will have done enough if he considers, first, as many mental processes as he can get names for; and, secondly, the branches of education which most people agree in thinking education ought to include, and treating these "scientifically"—that is, with strict deference to observed facts. The result is an uncommonly dry book. A few useful practical hints may, doubtless, be picked up here and there; but moral and emotional topics are treated in such a hard, economical and earthy spirit, that one cannot help pitying the unfortunate children whom Professor Bain's admirers may take in hand. Here is one of his prognostications in regard to punishment: "It is in graduated artificial inflictions, operating directly on the nerves by means of electricity, that we may look for the physical punishments of the future, that are to displace floggings and muscular torture" (p. 62).

Mr. Herbert Spencer devotes his first chapter to a detailed proof that all education ought to have for its subject-matter, science—that is, physical science. Of the numerous heresies and heterodoxies into which he strays in working out this conclusion we have no need to speak. The question which naturally occurs to most people is, How can science teach a child its last end, or its religion? Mr. Spencer has provided the answer. Science is religious—essentially, emphatically religious; for science "generates a profound respect for, and an implicit faith in, those uniformities of action which all things disclose" (p. 46); besides, it leads us clearly to recognise "the impossibility of comprehending the ultimate cause of things, by bringing us in every direction to boundaries we cannot pass" (p. 47). If any one objects that this is not religion but agnosticism, Mr. Herbert Spencer is sorry for him. His book, however, is interesting, amusing, and, in several details, useful enough. It is written rather on the side of the children against the parents; and Mr. Spencer's young people will have good times in matters of eating and drinking and of "experimentally" finding out what they should not do, and in a general disappearance of learning by rote and by "rules." But it is consoling to know that he utterly disapproves of Lord Palmerston's reckless dogma that "all children are born good" (p. 96).

The book of the late lamented Bishop of Orleans on the Education of Girls consists of a series of letters, which appear, from the words of Abbé Lagrange, in the introduction, to have been really addressed to parents, teachers, and children, but which the Bishop put together at Hyères during the last days of his life. It is refreshing after

wandering in the pathless and dry lands of Scotch philosophers and English physicists to turn over pages which begin with the Christian answer to the question, *Why did God make you?* The present work, however, although it rests on the immovable basis of Christian principle, is not precisely on education, but on the education of girls. The bishop, an educator from the earliest years of his priesthood, could not help being struck by the frivolity and ignorance of the greater number of the women of the better classes. The larger part of this work is taken up with impressing on women, by maxim, by reasoning, by history, and by example, the importance—nay, the simple necessity—of labour and of intellectual occupation. In the second part, the eloquent and earnest writer gives a great deal of excellent practical advice to those engaged in bringing up girls. Some of his strictures on the way that some boarding-schools and convents try to make girls pious are especially well-timed. All school-mistresses and nuns should read the two letters on Piety. He thinks that girls are often very “pious” and well-behaved with very little solid and real virtue. They have a pretty chapel, pretty music, and sweetly-spoken “sisters,” and their hearts and imaginations are warmed by it all; they are directed and encouraged to perform a number of “pious” practices; but their serious defects of character—their laziness, vanity, dissipation, or selfishness—are very much let alone; their piety is routine, and when the routine vanishes, no spontaneity exists to take its place; they have had “the rule” dinned into their ears, and when “the rule” is over the Gospel is not there to keep them straight; their school education has given them one or two school virtues, perhaps, but not prepared them to be good in their own families and in the world. As a very wise priest said, it does not do to bring up school-girls like novices; they should be more under the priest and less under the nuns, or else they run the risk of being formalists at school, and of never looking for any direction at all as soon as they have left school.

As the last work of Bishop Dupanloup, these thoughtful and beautifully-expressed letters will be widely read.

Le Téléphone, le Microphone, et le Phonographe. Par Le Comte Th. du MONCEL, Membre de l'Institut (Bibliothèque des Merveilles). 2me edition. Paris: Hachette et C^{ie}., 1878.

THE idea of transmitting sound to a distance, the author says, is as old as the world. The Greeks employed means of doing it, which they sometimes used in their oracles; but they did not get beyond tubes and speaking trumpets. The most ancient document suggesting clearly the telephonic idea dates back to the year 1667. In it one Dr. Robert Hooke says confidently that by using a tightened string sound can be instantly passed to a great distance, “if not as rapidly as light, incomparatively more quickly than sound travels in the air.” This idea is the basis of the “string” telephone, which came, however, long after. Who first invented it is not known; a large number of dealers all claim it for themselves. If certain travellers may be

believed, this "string" system has long been in vogue in Spain for love correspondence.

The notion of applying electric action to this sort of transmission ought to have come as soon as the marvellous effects of the electric telegraph were witnessed; but up to 1854 no one dared think it possible, and when M. Charles Bourseul published, at that date, his notice on the electric transmission of sound, people thought the idea a fanciful dream. This idea, however, bore the germ of the invention which has illustrated the names of Graham Bell and Elisha Gray. In 1876 the problem of electric transmission was at last solved; and the solution has raised a dispute as to the priority between the two last-named inventors. Indeed, the question is at present under discussion in the Supreme Court of the American Patents. It would appear that M. Charles Bourseul has the priority of idea, and that Mr. Bell has perfected the speaking telephone.

After this slight historical sketch the author of the work before us enters on long, but interesting, clearly put, and abundantly illustrated, accounts of the various instruments at present before the world. His first section is devoted to "Musical Telephones." First, that of M. Reiss, invented in 1860. One end of this instrument is provided with a large circular aperture, into which any instrument may be played or the voice may sing. The transmission is electrical. Messrs. Cecil and Leonard Wray are the authors of an instrument perfecting that of M. Reiss. The telephone of Mr. Elisha Gray, of Chicago, adds to the former "musical" instruments an important modification by which it can be adopted to telegraphy. All these and other instruments for the distant transmission of musical sounds are described at length.

Then we have "speaking" telephones, beginning with the stringed ones, the vendors of which have inundated the streets of every European city for some time back. We learn that they transmit easily 150 yards; that silk strings are the best, hemp the worst; they are generally made of cotton for sake of cheapness.

The electric telephone of Mr. Graham Bell was shown at the Philadelphia Exhibition of 1876. Sir W. Thompson called it the "wonder of wonders." Mr. Bell declares that the discovery was not a spontaneous happy conception, but was the result of long and patient researches on acoustics and the labours of physicists in that direction. A lucid but somewhat lengthy description is given both of Bell's and Elisha Gray's instruments.

Some people imagine that because Bell's telephone has not an electric pile it is not an electric instrument. The electric power, however, is produced by the action of magnets on a circuit. When well made this instrument gives very satisfactory results; speech is transmitted with the utmost clearness of tone and articulation. As in speaking to the deaf, so in speaking into the telephone, shouting goes for little; the thing is, to intone clearly and articulate well.

Mr. Edison finished, in 1876, an improvement on Bell's telephone. It is a pile telephone; it is less susceptible, in transmitting, to adverse

influences from without, and operates to a far greater distance. Mr. Edison, also, does away with a liquid conductor, and makes use of carbon. At the trials of his instrument on a telegraph line between New York and Philadelphia, and later between the Paris Exhibition and Versailles, the results have been satisfactory. The telephones of Colonel Navez, of Messrs. Pollard and Garnier, of M. Hellesen, of Messrs. Thomson and Houston, and several others are described in succession.

Next come some modifications of the general idea. First, those formed by a combination of several diaphragms in one instrument. Each diaphragm being accompanied by its own electro-magnetic organ, and the induction currents of all being united, the effect at the receiving end is intensified; the result equalling the combined transmissions, as a chorus equals the combined voices. Under this head the different inventions of Messrs. E. Gray, Phelps, Cox-Walker, Trouvé, and Demoget are described.

Certain experiments are next detailed, which have been made to determine how far each part of the instrument is essential. It would appear that almost every part may, under certain conditions, transmit the sound; and a telephone made without the vibrating plate was shown by Mr. Millar at the meeting of the British Association for 1878, in Dublin.

Among the many interesting experiments made with the telephone related here one is that of M. d'Arsonval, who wished to ascertain the degree of sensitiveness of this instrument. He compared it with that of a frog's nerve, which has been hitherto regarded as the most perfect of galvanoscopes. The result showed that the telephone was two hundred times more sensitive than the frog! Last among the experiments comes one which the author tells us, "*tout le monde peut faire.*" A telephone is applied to any part of the body in the vicinity of the chest, even outside one's clothes; then, the loudly spoken words of a person so treated are duly transmitted; "which makes it pretty clear that all the human body participates in the vibrations caused by speaking." In this case the vibrations are mechanically transmitted through the body to the connected instrument.

The applications, already made or contemplated, of the telephone to various useful purposes are next noticed. For domestic uses a telephone is cheaper and more useful than acoustic tubing, and can be better hid from view. The difference in cost of laying down the apparatus is, we are told, "already as 1 to 7." The electro-magnetic are the best, and always ready for working; they will probably soon accompany all electric bells in hotels and other large places. They promise to be still more useful in the fire-brigade service.

In the army they have so far not been a success in field operations by reason of surrounding noises: but they are already a proved success and a great boon in rifle and artillery practice. The advantages, neither few nor small, which the telephone gives promise of rendering to the marine services, especially in regard to torpedoes, to the inspec-

tion and working of mines, and to the advance of science through the perfection of experiments, are described at length.

A full account of the Microphone comes next. The author regrets the dispute between Mr. Hughes and Mr. Edison as to their claims to its invention, which has, he says, no *raison d'être*. The microphone is certainly only the "transmitter" of an Edison pile telephone, but altogether differently arranged, acting differently and constructed to serve a different purpose. The microphone magnifies the sound received; hence its name. But the microphone does not altogether act towards feeble sounds as does the microscope towards minute illumined objects. The former amplifies only the sounds resulting from vibrations which are mechanically transmitted to the apparatus by solid bodies. So the stepping of a fly across the "support" of the apparatus was like the tramping of a horse, and Mr. Hughes says the fly's death cry was audible. When a musical box was placed on the support, the clanging was so loud that the sounds could not be distinguished. The different varieties of the instrument are then explained. Useful, if not revolutionizing, applications of it, are projected, to telegraphy, to science, in the study of vibrations imperceptible to the senses, to medicine and surgery, in the stethoscope, &c., and to commerce.

Lastly, this charming book describes the Phonograph. "Mr. Edison's phonograph, which has engrossed so much attention for months past, is an apparatus which not only registers the different vibrations caused by speech on the vibrating plate, but also reproduces the speech according to the registered tracings." It is this last feature which is the great achievement of its inventor. M. Léon Scott had already, in 1856, invented his *Phonautographe* which successfully performed the first part of the operation: in which, also, early in 1877, M. Ch. Cros had been successful. Again, also before Mr. Edison, Messrs. Napoli and Marcel Duprez had endeavoured to construct a phonograph so unsuccessfully as to have concluded that the reproduction of speech from a mechanical tracing was an insoluble problem. Since hearing of Mr. Edison's achievement they have resumed their labours "and give us hope that some day they will present us with a still more perfect phonograph than Mr. Edison's." The phonograph consists chiefly of a registering cylinder turned by hand, in front of which is fixed a vibrating plate; above the latter is a telephone mouth-piece, whilst below it is a tracing point. The cylinder being set in motion, the operator speaks into the mouth-piece: the vibrations thus caused to the plate are communicated to the tracing needle, which in turn embosses them on a thin sheet of metal fastened to the cylinder. The speech ended, the sheet may be removed and kept in a portfolio for a future occasion. When it is desired to reproduce the speech the process is exactly reversed; the traced sheet is replaced on the cylinder, the needle-point put back into the groove it formerly made, the cylinder is set in motion and the needle carries back to the plate the vibrations it had before carried to the plate from the needle. There are other

models of the phonograph which the author describes, but they are on the same principle. At present a phonograph will trace 150 to 200 words per minute. This speed in writing and speaking instrumentally will at once suggest the line of application which its inventor believes will be most important, in letter writing, lecturing, electrotype, composition, &c. A person may read a book into the Phonograph; afterwards it may be read off at leisure or at any time by a large number of blind persons. It is impossible to forecast the future development, and the revolutions in social and domestic life, resulting from the three great inventions so graphically described in this little volume—the Telephone, the Microphone, and the Phonograph. A translation of the work is published by Messrs. Kegan Paul and Co.

Notices of Catholic Continental Periodicals.

GERMAN PERIODICALS.

(By Dr. BELLESHEIM, of Cologne.)

1. **THE** February issue of the *Katholik* opens with a learned article by Father Schneemann, S. J., on "Molinism and Congruism." F. Schneemann ranks amongst the best scholars the Society of Jesus has given us since its re-establishment in Germany. Fourteen years ago he published a very clever dissertation on Pope Honorius, a man who has been so much calumniated, and so seldom dispassionately understood, and vindicated him from error in teaching the faith. Afterwards he expounded several of the theses of the Syllabus, and amongst them principally those which concern the Church as a perfect society, independent of the State, her liberty and her rights; also several questions of canon law about matrimony. But, above all, Father Schneemann has deserved well of the Catholic cause, and secured for himself a world-wide fame, as principal editor of the "Acta et decreta Sacrorum Conciliorum recentiorum; collectio Lacensis, Friburgi, sumtibus Herder." Father Schneemann, in the above-named article of the *Katholik*, shows himself as well-versed in theology as he is in canon law. His aim is to defend his Society and the systems adopted by its scholars in reconciling divine prescience and human action, grace and liberty. In a former article in the *Katholik* on Thomism, Professor Rohling told us that the Thomist system was taught by S. Augustine and S. Thomas; following Billuart, he called the "efficacia ab intrinseco" a "dogma theologicum proxime definibile," and anticipated that it might be defined by the Church. Father Schneemann very appropriately writes: "Both schools profess as obvious truth (1) that by His preventing grace God infallibly produces our good actions; (2) that these actions are nevertheless really free ones—free not only from external coercion, but also from

interior necessity." The whole controversy, therefore, is about the question, In what manner may these two apparently contradictory facts be reconciled? This question has not been thoroughly discussed by S. Thomas. One of the greatest commentators of the Angelic doctor, Cardinal Cajetan, writing on the question, says, "Concerning this doubt I have not found anything in S. Thomas." Neither has the question been treated by S. Augustine. But, as remarks the great Dominican, Soto, since the Protestants insisted on the infallible efficacy of grace, it necessarily became the duty of the Catholic divines to expatiate on that topic. In discharging this duty they proceeded in different ways, and the Thomists, towards the end of the sixteenth century, were divided into two branches, one called simply the "Thomist school," following Bannez, Alvarez, and Lemos, the other venerating as their masters, Molina, Suarez, and Bellarmine. Both parties claimed S. Thomas as patron. It was no want of intellect or malice of will which caused these divines, together with S. Francis of Sales, and S. Alphonsus Liguori, to adopt a system departing from that of the Thomists. S. Alphonsus simply declares that he follows the systems of Cardinal Norris and of Tournely.

In the March and April issues of the *Katholik* we are presented with two treatises on the doctrine held by Duns Scotus, the great leader of the Franciscan school, on the *essence and nature of bodies*, both inorganic and organic. Twenty years ago nobody could have anticipated that ere long there would come a time in which the contest which was so eagerly fought during the Middle Ages, would once more create dissensions. We suppose it is generally known that the question about the nature of bodies—whether they consist of indivisible atoms, or are made up of "matter and form"—has divided the professors and graduates of the Catholic University of Poitiers into two parties, one of which defends the atomic system espoused by modern science, whilst the other faithfully clings to the doctrine of Aristotle and S. Thomas. The fact that those philosophers and divines who are atomists claim as their patron Duns Scotus, gave rise to the above-mentioned treatises in the *Katholik*. Our author succeeds in clearly demonstrating that no essential difference on this point can be found between S. Thomas and Scotus, and that therefore the atomists in vain endeavour to protect themselves with the name of Duns Scotus. As to *inorganic* bodies, all the great mediæval doctors taught that they consist of matter and form, and Duns Scotus is so far from disclaiming this theory, that, on the contrary, he extends it to the human soul and the angels: whatever is created is, according to him, made up of matter and form, and, curiously enough, Scotus, following Avicenna, holds that the "matter" of spiritual beings is the same in substance as that of corporeal beings. But as the form in spiritual beings vivifies and penetrates them in a far higher degree than in corporeal beings, hence Duns Scotus concludes that the composition of matter and form in spiritual beings is not in any way at variance with their unity and simplicity. There is another difference between

S. Thomas and Duns Scotus—viz., that Scotus attributes to matter, although not yet influenced by the form, existence; but this difference exists more in words than in reality, as Scotus does not attribute actuality to matter in the same sense as S. Thomas, but only inasmuch as matter taken as reality differs from the form, and thus act and "form" are one and the same, and everything existing outside of its cause may be styled "act." Hence, even the *materia prima*, as it is severed from, and exists independently of, its cause, may be so called. On the other side, S. Thomas considers act and form as identical ideas, and hence denies existence to matter before it is pervaded by the form. According to him, matter is never without form, although the form gives to the matter *not its material being*, but determines it to be a *certain* and *real* being. The result, however, is that, notwithstanding the alleged differences, there reigns a perfect harmony between the two great doctors, as both of them profess the old doctrine of *matter and form*. Proceeding to the doctrine of Scotus on the nature of *man*, we find that he exaggerates the old doctrine that soul and body constitute the human being, by attributing to the body a certain form independently from the soul, calling it "*forma corporeitatis*." The principal reason on which he basis this theory is the state of our body after death. Assuming the soul as cause of the life of our body, it seems difficult to understand how the body after being left by the soul nevertheless preserves its form, since with the form disappears also being. As a new form does not enter the body, it follows that the body, by death, does not lose its proper form, which consequently must differ from the soul. Scotus was on that point opposed by S. Thomas, who refuted him in his treatise "*De Pluralitate Formarum*," which has been commented on in our days by Father Cornoldi.

In the February issue of the *Katholik* I gave an account of Mr. Orby Shipley's work, "*Principles of the Faith in Relation to Sin*," and his conversion to the Catholic Church, principally insisting on the acuteness of the author's reasoning, in pointing out the prominent principle of Catholicism, that of *authority*. The April issue publishes, according to the original found in the archives of Monte Cassino, a letter, unknown up to our time, addressed by S. Thomas of Aquino to the Abbot of that celebrated monastery. We cannot pass over in silence a learned book published by Canon Frint at Prague, about S. John of Nepomuk, which is very favourably criticised in the *Katholik*. As the real existence of S. John has been frequently attacked by infidel historians, Canon Frint, with the utmost diligence, has collected whatever has previously been published on this topic, and his dissertation may claim the great merit of having dispelled whatsoever doubts yet remained. In Bohemia it was always supposed that S. John suffered martyrdom in 1383. A doubt about the accuracy of that date was raised in 1754, when Antony of Wokum, suffragan of the Archbishop of Prague, returning home from Rome, brought with him the original of the denunciation sent in 1393 to the Holy See by Archbishop Jenstein against King Wenzel, and the cruelties he had indulged in against John Pomuk, "my spiritual Vicar." Canon

Frint shows clearly that there are not, as was gratuitously asserted, two Johns of Nepomuk, but only one—viz., the one who was put to death in 1393; and, further, that it is this martyr whom the Church has canonized.

2. The *Historisch-politische Blätter*, in their issue of April 16, present us with a learned essay on the question whether the name of the great Apostle of Germany is in Latin *Bonifatius* or rather *Bonifacius*. A few years ago many German scholars began to style him "Bonifatius," deriving the name from "bonum fatum," and insisting chiefly on the fact that in the fifth and fourth centuries the name was generally spelt so. Our author, with the strongest possible arguments, defends the old spelling "Bonifacius," handed down to us from many centuries, and sanctioned by the official documents of the Church. Our Saint, at first called Winfred, was honoured with this new name by Pope Gregory II., who, in giving it to him, wished to recognize him as a bishop who already had performed good works, and was called upon to perform them again. S. Boniface is not the man of "bonum fatum," but the "vir bonorum operum." Who could suppose the Pope had hinted at the *fate* of the heathens? It is quite possible that De Rossi's "Inscriptiones Christianæ" testify to the spelling recently introduced in Germany; but nobody who is not quite a stranger in the etymology of the latter times of the Roman empire is ignorant that the carvers in marble or stone exhibit too much carelessness, or rather ignorance, to permit us to propose them as masters of orthography. The issue of April 1st has an able article (the sixth on this topic) on the present and future condition of the Established Anglican High Church, especially the "Catholic" party in it. Two other articles of greater length comment on the influence which the Freemasons are now beginning publicly to exercise in Belgium in legislation, particularly in the education question, and the recent attempts of the French freethinkers to secularize the school system and to sever its connection with the Church. The article on the French education system is a remarkable one, as it affords most accurate details on the immense benefits derived from schools conducted by religious orders, their number, the saving they are to the community, the flourishing and hopeful state of the Catholic universities, and the great evils Unavoidably connected with the State Lycées and Universities. One of the most lamentable evils is the utter want of discipline and the deficiency of self-denial and "education." A high German statesman is credited with the sentiment, "As soon as we get tired of the 'Cultur-kampf' we shall send it to France." May Catholic France be spared this cruel and dangerous trial! Two other articles treat on "The Present Position of the Elementary Schools in Germany." They involve many grave accusations against our modern elementary schools; children in great towns are treated according to the same system as those of the country; the dangerous principle, "*multa, sed non multum*," is adopted; children are too long detained at the school desks, which gives rise to a comparatively too quick development of mental culture, whilst that of the body is neglected, and, lastly, instruction is insensibly severed from "education" and

religion. "I am a sceptic as to the dogma generally believed in our days," said Governor Gratz-Braun, of St. Louis, in 1873, "that the system of education, adopted in our time, is a foundation for virtue and morality. I know it is an opinion generally held, that ignorance brings forth vice, and learning is the way to virtue; but facts openly refute this tenet."

3. The March issue of the *Stimmen aus Maria Laach* opens with a dissertation by Father Lehmkuhl on "Interest and Usury," explaining the provisions of canon law, which prohibited any interest from a loan in money, as money was considered in the Middle Ages not to be "fruitful," but was held to meet only the immediate wants of him to whom it was lent. It became his *property*; he could not, therefore, be obliged to return more than he had received. Father Lehmkuhl goes on to explain those reasons, external to this contract as such, for which the Church allows the capitalist to receive out of his capital a proper interest. Father Pesch subjects to a thorough criticism our "modern theories of State as opposed to the Christian state." Those theories spring up from Kant's philosophy. Kant's system on this topic may be described in the following propositions:—1. Mankind is autonomous, and whatever men do they may do without any respect to God or to the order He has founded. 2. The State is the only origin of every right and may claim an unqualified obedience to its laws. 3. The Church is to be totally severed from the civil society of the State, but notwithstanding this separation her influence on the people is to be kept down, and to be watched over by the Government. 4. The highest degree of perfection to which we can aim is to become good citizens of this world. Father Spillman treats on the arraignment of Father Ogilvie, F. Ehrte on Spellman's well-known work, and F. Meschler on the Jubilee.

4. To the *Literarische Rundschau* I contributed an account of the Bishop of Ossory's "Spicilegium Ossoriense" and the "American Catholic Quarterly Review of 1878."

ITALIAN PERIODICALS.

La Civiltà Cattolica. Maggio: Firenze. 1879.
Pius IX. and Charles Albert.

THE May numbers of the *Civiltà Cattolica* contain articles of interest entitled "Pio IX. e Carlo Alberto." The occasion is a publication by Signor Nicomede Bianchi (an indefatigable commentator on public and private documents in the interests of Liberalism) of a new work intended to illustrate the memory of Charles Albert, and to claim him as the progenitor of "United Italy," and the patriarch, as it were, of the Revolution which brought it about. It is true that, with the written evidence before him, Bianchi cannot deny the palpable truth that Charles Albert was always and above all a Christian, a Catholic, and a faithful adherent of the Pope and of the Church—incapable, from his ardent faith and strict religious principles, of injuring or offending in any way against the rights, liberty, or

person of the Sovereign Pontiff, for whom he entertained the deepest reverence, and whom he regarded, moreover, as the corner-stone of that greatness which it was his ambition to secure for Italy. Charles Albert was ambitious, but his ambition cannot be regarded as a vulgar one; and Bianchi himself draws attention to the ultimate object which he ever kept in view. "I have no other desire but that of one day winning Paradise," were his own words, and Bianchi candidly quotes passages from his letters, ranging between the ages of twenty-three and forty-two, which prove the nobleness of this monarch's aims. He endeavours, it is true, to attenuate this, his true glory, by alleging, with much complacency, a few facts and documents which he considers to prove that Charles Albert was not a King ready to give ear to the suggestions of priests and monks in affairs appertaining to the competence of lay authority, or one who would forego his rights as Sovereign to surrender to them the free exercise of undue prerogatives. In support of this view—one quite natural to a writer of his class—he has little which is solid to advance, or which goes far to establish it.

Whatever mistakes this monarch may have made, and under whatever illusions he may have laboured as to the means of realising that dream of his life, Italian independence, there is nothing whatsoever to prove, but everything to disprove, that he had any idea of enlarging his own dominions further than by the addition of Lombardo-Venetia, thus substituting the rule of Piedmont in Upper Italy for that of the Austrians. As for entrenching on the rights or of usurping any portion of the dominions of the Holy See, this would have been as repulsive to his conscience as it would have been foreign to his predominant idea. One of the seals he commonly used represented an armed warrior on horseback, with the motto, "Ad majorem Dei gloriam;" the other bore that of the lion clutching a falcon, with the motto, "J'attends mon astre." The star which he expected was, however, certainly not to be identified, as Bianchi would pretend, with that which the anti-Christian and Masonic Revolution has since designated "The Star of Italy," but was the star of the hitherto always Catholic and Papal House of Savoy. Bianchi, in fact, afterwards confesses as much—contradicting himself when he comes to speak of the hopes which the state of things in 1848 awakened in the bosom of Charles Albert; and says that the expected star seemed at last to have dawned and the time to have arrived when his ideal Italy might be realised—an ideal which, even as represented by Signor Bianchi, differed *toto cælo* from that which the Revolution has carried out. Charles Albert's idea was, in fact, a Guelphic Italy. "His fancy," observes Bianchi, "gifted with all that ardour which is to be found in men of the South, and the faith which powerfully ruled his heart, as that of a mediæval crusading knight, made him long for the virile joys of battles, as champion of a Guelphic Italy. Why Guelphic? Because it was as such that reviving Italy was lovingly contemplated by the pious and chivalric King of the House of Savoy."

If, all things considered, Signor Bianchi deals with the character of Charles Albert more impartially than could be expected, as much

cannot be said of his treatment of Pius IX. After stating that he could not succeed in discovering more than three letters between the Pope and Charles Albert—in making which assertion we suppose we must credit him with good faith—he nevertheless proceeds, in the absence of this documentary evidence (which he allows would be desirable to throw light on the years 1847 and 1848), to bring various charges against the venerable Pontiff. He was “greatly deficient in the power of discerning well the true aspect of contemporary facts;” he had “great want of penetration, great inexperience in government;” he was “by nature inclined to vanity, and most ready to allow himself to be unconsciously transported from one thing to another by the breath of popular applause.” To meet these malignant accusations against the immortal Pius IX.—which, however, only discredit him who makes them—the reviewer in the *Civiltà Cattolica* avails himself of the authentic materials laid up during the Pontificate of the late Holy Father, which contain almost the whole of his correspondence with Charles Albert, and furnishes some very interesting extracts which throw a lustre on the memory of Pius IX., and are highly honourable also to the Catholic traditions of the House of Savoy, so well personified in Charles Albert, who, unhappily, was to carry them with him to the grave.

From this correspondence it may be gathered that the fundamental idea of Pius IX.’s policy, in the perilous times which followed his exaltation to the Chair of Peter, was to procure the union of the Italian princes amongst each other with the Holy See for their connecting bond, in order internally to secure peace by resisting the factions which had conspired the ruin of their States, and externally to provide against all provocations to unjust and ambitious wars. England is proved to have shown much favour to the Papal policy at this time and to the projects of reform which it included. Amongst other testimonies to this effect, the reviewer quotes a letter from Mgr. Corboli, the representative of Pius IX. at the Court of Turin, written in the autumn of 1847, mentioning how Lord Minto, having arrived in that city, desired to see him, and how after he had detailed to him the political views of the Holy Father, Lord Minto expressed much admiration for the profound wisdom with which the Pope ruled his own States and of the salutary influence he was exercising throughout Italy, adding that the union of its princes in a wise and moderate progress was fully conformable to the views of England, which saw therein the only means of preserving the peace of the Peninsula.

It is well known how the Revolution defeated the successful issue of Pius IX.’s large-hearted designs; for this failure *he* was not responsible. Charles Albert, notwithstanding his devotion to the Holy See, added to the Pope’s embarrassments by declaring war against Austria. It was an illusion under which he laboured, that by this war he should strengthen his own monarchy, and equally so that the Pope could ever be brought to favour and aid it. Neutrality was a strict obligation of the Holy See; all that Pius IX. could do, since he was powerless to prevent his own subjects from enlisting in the cause,

was to arrange with Charles Albert to take these volunteers under his tutelage, and thus procure them the benefit from which international law would have excluded them had they fought under no banner. It would be difficult to conceive all the anguish which must have wrung the heart of the Father of Christendom at that period. On one side, the triumphant Revolution was urging him to declare war against Austria, and, morally, to head it; on the other, every duty of honour, justice, and holiness forbade such an aggression on a Catholic Power which had given him no cause to attack it. His name was also used by the revolutionary sects against his will, for the manifest advantage which it brought them of lending the war a religious colouring, and this provoked resentment throughout Germany, and caused scandal which he was bound to remove. A malignant interpretation was likewise put on his blessing imparted to Italy, as if it was a solemn sanction given to the war. Finally, the Pontifical troops under the orders of the Piedmontese General, Durando, having without the Holy Father's consent crossed the frontiers to do battle with Austria, it was needful that the common Father of the Faithful should speak out clearly, and make known his true intentions. The letter which he wrote to his envoy at Turin two days before the celebrated Allocution of Peace delivered in the Consistory of the 27th of April, 1848, with a view to its communication to Charles Albert, exhibits his mind so simply, and yet so forcibly, that we cannot do better than quote it. "My position is most difficult, the excited minds here absolutely insist on my pronouncing the word *war*, a thing which I ought not to do. What I think of saying the day after to-morrow to the Cardinals in Consistory is in substance this: That if the reforms granted and the amnesty conceded are the cause of present occurrences, then I am certainly the cause of them. It is true, however, that the five principal Powers gave my predecessor those counsels, which were by me spontaneously put in practice; and so, if in Germany they complain of the Pope and lay the blame of what is happening on him, the Cabinets of Austria, Prussia, and Russia, who proffered the advice, are likewise causes of the present events. I say, the Pope makes war on no one, but at the same time he cannot prevent the ardent desire for Italian nationality from urging the troops of General Durando over the frontiers. Finally, I say that I frankly renounce the seductive projects of the Republicans, who would make of Italy a Republic, with the Pope at its head. I say I renounce these projects, because they would be immensely hurtful to Italy, and because the Holy See has no intention, and never had, to enlarge its temporal dominions, but only the kingdom of Jesus Christ. These are my sentiments, which you may make use of when prudence shall direct. For the rest, in this state of things, I am not cast down; I am not solicitous, I am not alarmed. I place my cause in the hands of God and fully confide in Him."

This letter is a mirror of Pius IX.'s noble, firm, and most religious mind. The army was taken out of his hands and impelled to a war in which the conscience and dignity of the Head of the Church forbade him to participate. He is aware that his refusal to do so, and

the raising of his voice to declare his neutrality as Sovereign, will excite against him the most furious tempest, from which he has no apparent means of escape. He hears the offer made to him by the Revolution of being placed at the head of all the States of Italy, if he will only consent to cover with the august tiara of St. Peter the political unity which it desires to form, and not only does he indignantly reject the wicked proposal, but he denounces it to the world as bad and fatal to Italy. He is pressed on all sides by entreaties, promises, menaces; wild cries resound in his ears, but he stands firm against the surging Revolution, sacrificing to the justice and decorum of the Holy See all the immense popularity he possessed, and placing his confidence in God alone. Such was Pius IX., so lightly charged with weakness and vanity. Had he been weak and vain, had he yielded to the seducing promises of the Revolution of 1848, accepting the offer of "maturing Italy," constituting it *one* under his sceptre, making use of the immense power of his name and authority to restore to it its old, popular, and municipal forms of local government, binding all to himself and to Rome as its centre, who can say whether any one of the dynasties of the Peninsula would ever have regained possession of its dominions? But the supposition is absurd. A Pope can never be the usurper of crowns and thrones. Pius IX. replied with "the great refusal," because before every human interest and earthly ambition he placed conscience, justice, the soul, the Church, and thus gave an example worthy of being had in eternal remembrance, to the confusion of those who, unable to imitate his magnanimity, have the meanness to impute it to him as a disgrace and a crime.

La Scuola Cattolica. 30 Aprile, 1879. Milano.

The Prussian Index.

THE *Scuola Cattolica* of April 30th has an article on the Prussian Index of prohibited books. It begins thus: "Praise be to God! At last they have understood it. The free press is an evil, a mischief, a peril for society. And it is not a *codino*, a bigot, a clerical, a retrogradist, an obscurantist who says so. It is no less than that great Prince, the Prussian Chancellor, who is not content with affirming it, but applies himself to forming an Index of those books which he considers as pernicious to Society; so that even they who scoff at the Roman Index of prohibited books must bow their heads and believe, on the infallibility of the Prussian Chancellor, that these books contain the views which are poisoning society, and which would conduct it to ruin if the Prussian Index had not come in time." The physician in this case is doing the thing thoroughly, for, not contented with proscribing the poisonous ingredients, he is imprisoning the poisoners, closing their pharmacies, dispersing their scientific socialistic meetings; in fine, he is laying his hand to purge society of these iniquitous quacks. There is reason to fear, however, that he has opened his eyes a little too late; that what can no longer be done in public will be done secretly, and that the police, notwithstanding its Argus eyes, will

not have enough to detect all the work of the sects. The reviewer adds that, while not displeased at these measures of the Chancellor, he may be inclined to tell him that he ought to say a *mea culpa* for the liberty he has himself given to the Revolution at home, and the help he has afforded it in other people's houses. He who fans the flame which is burning other men's dwellings may expect to see his own on fire. Liberals are not particular about consistency, and are quite in the habit of being in strong contrast with their theories. Liberty of the press is one of the foremost of these. Well, then, I may speak against the King, against the laws, against the verdict of a jury, the decision of a judge, and what not? No, that is forbidden. Do you not know that a law regulates the liberty of the press? Then it is not free. It is free, and it is not free; a proposition which reconciles itself admirably in the heads of the Liberals who are equal to reconciling a circle and a square. But here is one who altogether gives Liberal theories the lie, severely prohibiting certain books and enacting a new set of laws for the prosecution of the writers and of the promoters of condemned doctrines, and much more of those who, more logical than their masters, would extend liberty of thinking, speaking, and writing, to liberty of acting, as did Hoedel and Nobiling. As for us, says the reviewer, without caring to examine the books in order to ascertain if they were deservedly condemned, we believe it on the Chancellor's word, perhaps more than he himself believes it, and proceed to draw out an apology for the measure.

The question—that is, of the absolute freedom of the press—seems one which common sense might decide, only that this same free press has well-nigh driven common sense out of the world. The writer then proceeds to examine this boasted freedom of man to think, speak, and publish what he wills by the light of first principles. If you do not wish to pass for being demented, you are bound to allow that in the case of abstract and metaphysical truths, liberty of thought is certainly restricted. A man cannot think that two and two make five, or that a circle is not round. In the matter of physical truths he is equally limited by ascertained facts.

Now as to morals: if I were to say that I am free to think that I have a right to appropriate their purses, or to stick a knife into their hearts, would freethinkers be disposed to grant me this liberty? But if thought is not absolutely free, certainly its manifestations, which may prove most injurious to others, cannot be so, and if it be not free to men to speak all that they will, much less can they be free to put it in print, which is not only to fix it, but to disseminate it broad-cast over the whole civilized world. Who could sum up the evils and the mischief produced by a free and licentious press? Governments must by this time know something of its practical results; but to return to the repressive censorship is no slight undertaking for them. It is easier to keep the beast in check when he has the muzzle on, than to replace it if you have had the simplicity to take it off. Governments have had the complaisance to do so, with fatal damage not only to religion and morality, but to their own authority.

It is indeed impossible, says the reviewer, for any Government to hold out long with such a pest in its house. When every rascal is at liberty to censure, without restriction, every law or governmental act, to defame every magistrate, to throw ridicule on the justest measures, to persuade the people that they are ill-governed, that their rights are violated, that they should assert their claims by force should other measures fail of effect, what Government can long make head against such a state of things? The experience of the revolutions of the last century will reply; nor is there the least sign of the closing of their era. Are people satisfied? Far from it. When a revolution has been accomplished which contents one party, its hungry opponents, by the help of the free press, begin to assail the victors for the simple reason that they have themselves no share in the coveted banquet. We may, therefore go to bed to-night as Constitutional Monarchists, without knowing whether to-morrow we may not awake Conservative Republicans or Red Republicans. But is it conceivable that it can be the will of God to abandon society to the caprice, the instability, and the impious cravings of every adventurer who by *fas et nefas* may succeed in disturbing, subverting, and ruining it? Yet all these evils flow from the unshackled liberty, or rather license of the press: that liberty cannot, therefore, be reckoned among the most suitable means for procuring the well-being of society, and this the Prussian Chancellor has understood; who, by prohibiting certain books and journals which assail the most vital principles of all human fellowship, has thus justified the Catholic Church, which, for the protection of religion and morality, and for the interests of society itself, watches over the public press, subjecting it to a censure, and maintaining the Index of prohibited books wisely ordained by the Council of Trent

FRENCH AND BELGIAN PERIODICALS.

Revue Catholique de Louvain. Mars et Avril, 1879.

AN interesting article by M. R. Van Messem, contained in these two numbers, shows that the present Belgian Ministry seeks to annoy the Church on more points than on that of elementary education, and that the spirit which prompts it, however ostentatiously dressed in the garb of politeness, argumentation, and lofty motives, is the same, and leads to the same results, as that which devastated our own once Catholic country with rudeness and force, and for avowedly meaner objects. The article is entitled "Endowments for Masses in Belgium and the Ministerial Circular of 20th September, 1878." A part of the foundations for masses in Belgium date anteriorly to the French Revolution, and have survived through numerous vicissitudes to the present day; a part have been made since the Concordat of 1801 re-established the Catholic religion in its rights. What ought to be the stipend (*honorarium*) of the priest who discharges these obligations? The Minister of Justice, in the Circular named, has undertaken to answer a question which nobody seems to have raised.

Hitherto the priest received whatever honorarium the endowment

gave him, and no Government thought of interfering. Now, M. Bara has drawn a distinction which is not only unjust but oppressive to the clergy, hurtful by consequence to the poor, and prejudicial to works of charity. Indeed, the true motive of the Circular is exactly to compass these ends. Some of these endowments, says the Minister, are made in favour of the priest; some are in favour of the church (*fabrique*), with the obligation of masses attached. In the first case, as it is a personal revenue, the priest is to have what has been bequeathed to him, minus only the revenue tax; in the last case he is to receive only what is the fixed stipend of the diocese. Donations left for masses can only be legally paid at the rate of the diocesan tariff. And the Circular has already been put into action, to the detriment of the clergy concerned.

The writer of the article takes occasion before discussing the motives and the equity of this Ministerial intervention to give a learned and interesting sketch of the origin and history of the *honorarium* and the rules which govern it in Canon law.

The Church has never had payments for masses, as though the mass could be rated at a *price*. But from St. Paul's day onwards, the honorarium, or its equivalent, has existed, and for the Apostle's reason: the minister of the altar should live by the altar (1 Cor. ix. 13). At the beginning, it was the offertory; and the offertory was exclusively bread and wine, of which a sufficient part was used in the sacrifice, and the remainder taken for the support of the ministers. Later the offerings were of all kinds, including money. Authors are not agreed when precisely the *honorarium* in our modern acceptance began—viz., an offering to the priest, in return for which the donor has the fruits of the sacrifice for his special intention; some say it is not anterior to the eighth century; others, that it is much earlier. Certainly, from the eighth century the practice was universal. Bishops, popes, and councils took much pains that the custom should not degenerate into an abuse. Finally, Honorius III. restricted each priest to one mass daily for this object. And the Council of Trent, in its twenty-second Session, put forth detailed and strict regulations for the same end.

The diocesan tariff is not an absolute rule. A priest asked to offer the holy sacrifice may do so freely, if the request come from the poor; he may accept a larger gift if the demand come from the rich. The diocesan tariff is a fixed sum beyond which he has no right to ask anything from those who would secure his masses. It varies, too, with times and places; it is the ordinance of the bishop; the bishop alone has the right to alter it; though the Civil Government may ask that the tariff be submitted to its approbation.

When the Church or a priest accepts endowments or offerings for masses, a contract is formed between the two sides; one asks a favour and makes an offering, the other accepts the conditions and engages to fulfill them carefully. It implies on the part of the priest an obligation of justice, and a long list of ecclesiastical laws and censures regulate the exact fulfilment of the obligation and the prevention of abuses. Pius IX. fulminates excommunication, reserved to the

Sovereign Pontiff, and to be incurred, *ipso facto*, by priests who dare to gather rich intentions and have their masses celebrated in other places where the tariff is lower. Yet M. Bara does not hesitate to accuse the clergy of doing a lucrative trade in mass-offerings, and hints that Rome does not distinctly forbid it.

The author then gives a brief history of the Catholic custom of bequeathing alms or foundations for the purpose of securing masses for the *deceased* donor. In the very first ages of the Church, and before the present usage of *honorarium*, the faithful, believing in the efficacy of the sacrifice beyond the grave, made offerings even of goods and lands for securing a share in the sacrificial prayers; their names were inscribed on the sacred diptychs. In many churches there was the custom of placing this list before the eyes of the celebrant as he offered mass.

A sketch is next given of the effects of the French Revolution on religion in Belgium, to show that these endowments were spared during even that ordeal, if not altogether from a sentiment of reverence for the wishes of the dead, from a conviction of the equity of the contract between the donor and the priest. "It has been reserved for M. Bara to break with all these administrative traditions, and thus to inaugurate a system of legal persecution against the Catholic clergy, whose salutary influence he desires to diminish at any cost." The arguments of the Minister are then dealt with in detail. In conclusion comes a paragraph which will probably surprise all for the manifest injustice it reveals. "Another question raised by the Circular is: When bequests are made for the support of the clergy, is the amount of revenue thus accruing to them to be deducted from the stipend paid them by the State?" M. Bara says *it is*. "Such a legacy," he says, "has no other effect than to relieve the public treasury of the whole or a part of its obligation towards the legatee priest."

The State salary to the clergy is the payment of a real debt of justice—a compensation for the goods and possessions unjustly taken from them in 1789. The legislator of 1789 himself acknowledged this; in the Decree which placed ecclesiastical possessions at the disposal of the nation, he expressly declared that it was "at the price of providing, in a becoming manner, the expenses of worship, the support of churches, and the relief of the poor." Mirabeau said to the National Assembly that there was no more sacred debt than this. The Concordat of 1801 stipulated the same obligation in return for the ratification granted by the Pope of the sale of Church property. All Governments since, in Belgium as in France, have regarded the endowment of the clergy as a public debt. And at the National Congress Art. 117 of the Constitution was voted in this sense. What revolution has spared, a ministry of "progress" threatens to seize!

There are articles on the educational crisis in Belgium in the *Revue Catholique de Louvain*, for March and April, by M. C. Pieraert; in the *Revue Catholique des Institutions et du Droit* (Paris), for April, by M. Robinet de Cléry, and by M. Daniel Touzaud. It will be sufficient thus to indicate them to those who may be desirous of reading on

the subject in detail. The purport of the proposed law, and its bearing on Catholic interests and prospects in Belgium, are clearly set forth in Professor Lamy's article in our present number.

Revue Générale. Juin, 1879. Bruxelles.

"**L**A Philosophie Naturelle en Angleterre," an article by Professor Provost, of the University of Louvain, contains a sketch in appreciation of Herbert Spencer's system of philosophy. "The learned English economist has brought to the study of social, metaphysical, and psychological problems the acuteness of observation, inexhaustible imagination and spirit of patient analysis which characterise the physical philosophers beyond the Channel, and which is the reason of the popularity which Darwinism just now enjoys." But the writer justly blames indiscriminate admiration for the work of Spencer. "People forget that it is not enough that a theory be new and original in order to be true, and that if it succeeds in uniting together all facts—material, biological, psychological, and social in its synthesis, that may be because, perhaps, it defeats criticism by the vague and abstract phraseology in which it is artistically clothed." Such is the case with Spencer's philosophy, spite of his rare powers of observation, induction, analysis, and even of synthesis. One thing cannot be denied him, whether he be rightly or wrongly the head of the modern positivist school—viz., his immense erudition. He founds his doctrine of progress by Evolution on the chemistry of Lavoisier and the principles of modern mechanics, especially of thermodynamics, to which we owe the discovery of the "conservation of energy." By the light of this discovery other *savants*, among them Father Secchi, had already explained the genesis, evolution, and conservation of worlds, as also the physico-chemical phenomena which preceded organization on the earth. The best explanation of vital action by thermodynamics was given by Father Carbonelle, a Jesuit, in the *Etudes* of Paris, long before the works of Spencer were popular in France. A long but clear analysis is then given of Spencer's system, commencing with its "point of departure from the indestructibility of matter and of energy, the two grand acquisitions of modern chemistry and physics." "It cannot be denied," says the writer, "that, even in a perfect state, there is anatomically and physiologically less difference between a man and a monkey than there is between a monkey and a reptile or bird. The human body is a machine formed of the same materials and subject to the same forces and laws as those of animals. Within these limits the question of the origin of bodies is reduced to small importance; whether the body of man descends from a pre-existing organism or does not, none the less is his body that of an animal. . . . This is important, because false notions, especially of anatomy, still lead many spiritualist philosophers to isolate the human organism in creation, and to reject with horror the hypothesis of the animal origin of man. The hypothesis is, in truth, far from being proved, although learned Catholics are not opposed to accepting it, and pulpit orators, such as Père Monsabré,

are disposed to admit the existence of a precursor of man in the ancient and new world, in order to explain the discovery of the numerous traces of human industry in pre-historic times. It should be remarked, too, that Darwin has never taught that man descends from the monkey, but from an animal stock, from which monkeys may well have been a departure, since they are so near man in organization. There is really a confusion between community of *origin* and a community of *nature*. But the former exists from a *physical point of view*. This fact, however, trenches on no religious teaching; we are nowhere told that God made the body of man to His own image and likeness."

Revue des Questions Historiques. Avril, 1879. Paris. "*Étude sur Jérôme Savonarole des Frères Prêcheurs.*" Par le R. P. E.-C. Bayonne, du même ordre. Paris: Poussielgue, 1879.

UNE nouvelle étude sur Savonarola," by M. Henri de l'Épinois, gives a résumé of this recently published book. It is related that Pius VII. said, "In heaven I shall have a solution of this question of Savonarola." The solution has not failed for want of workers. Multitudes of books, by names of worth, have alternately handled and blackened the memory of the Dominican Friar. This latest volume, by the Père Bayonne, has this merit, that it rests on documents for the most part unpublished, or at least only recently brought to light, which throw light on more than one point hitherto obscure. Was Savonarola an impostor, or was he sincere and enlightened? Was he a proud and disobedient monk? Authors have thought all these things of him; Père Bayonne thinks he was an extraordinary man, raised by Divine goodness to fill the rôle of the ancient prophets. "The case is not yet settled: but assuredly the facts here related by the new historian with more precision and more exactness than by his predecessors and the evidences collected by him are too important not to merit notice, and will give food for reflection to those who still hesitate and doubt." The testimony in favour of Savonarola's holiness made by St. Francis of Paula, though rejected by Papebrock as resting on an unauthentic letter, is here accepted, since the arguments against it have been vigorously refuted by Mgr. Perrimezzi, Consultor of the *Index*. The most critical point in the history of the Florentine religious is his relation with Alexander VI. This point has been carefully examined by the author. The Briefs for the excommunication of Savonarola cannot be denied; neither can the accusations launched against this "son of iniquity" for teaching perverse dogma. But all that they clearly show is the manner in which the Pope was circumvented and deceived. The legate was gained over by the Arrabiati and the Tepidi, to represent that Savonarola's preaching was hostile to the Pope and dangerous to Italy. After calling him to Rome on the 20th July, 1495, and suspending him from preaching, by a letter dated 20th of September, and by another of the 16th of October, the Pope, through the Procurator-General of the Order, made an offer to Savonarola of the Cardinalate, if he would cease announcing future

events. His offer was refused, and the Pope, admiring the refusal, said, "This man must be a great servant of God," and wished thenceforth to hear no more said about him. But the Preacher had enemies both in and outside his Order, and his excommunication of the 13th May was solicited by other religious, and perhaps paid for in money—if reliance can be placed on a manuscript life of him kept at St. Mark's. Savonarola declared he was falsely accused by his enemies, and besought the Pope not to listen to malice but carefully to inform himself in the matter. He denied the validity of the excommunication, said the Pope had been deceived, and was sincere, perhaps, in affirming that he would have acted contrary to charity if he had submitted to it. Alexander VI. himself, late in life, rejected the decisions made at the instance of cruelty and passion, and many Popes seem to have had a persuasion of Savonarola's innocence and unjust condemnation.

Notices of Books.

Galileo Galilei and the Roman Curia. By KARL VON GEBLER. Translated by MRS. G. STURGE. London: C. Kegan Paul and Co. 1879.

THE *Pall Mall Gazette* of May 14th, in a strongly anti-Catholic review of the above work, thus characterizes its literary merits. We appropriate the passage, because we are disposed entirely to concur with it, and it is not worth while to take trouble in expressing afresh what has already been expressed:—

"The late Herr von Gebler's monograph," says the *Pall Mall* critic, "is by far the best of the numerous works that have appeared on the subject. Its calm weighing of facts, and the calm research by which these facts have been ascertained, are the more remarkable, as the author was not an experienced historian, but a cavalry officer, who died at the age of twenty-eight, shortly after the completion of his work. The genesis of that work is worthy of notice. One of the author's earliest literary efforts was a critical study of so-called 'Historic Sayings,' among which 'E pur si muove' naturally occupied a prominent place. This brought him into close acquaintance with Galileo's life, and especially with his trial by the Inquisition; and the result was the first edition of the present work (in 1875), which created a sensation in Germany, and still more in Italy. So far the author had resorted for the most part to generally accessible sources, such as the well-known publication by De l'Epinois of part of the Vatican MS. relating to the trial, and other works. But when, in 1876, Dominico Berti, who also had examined the Acts in the Vatican, taunted the German scholars with their ignorance of the original documents, Gebler at once resolved to remedy the defect; and, in spite of his failing health, went to Rome, where for ten weeks, during the oppressive heat of the summer of 1877, he spent fourteen hours a day in the Papal Archives, studying and copying the Acts of Galileo's trial. The first result of this absorbing and, in large measure,

suicidal labour was the frank acknowledgment of an error. Gebler, like other German scholars, had found reason to believe that the celebrated document, dated February 26th, 1616, which played so important a part in Galileo's trial, was a late fabrication. Now he found himself obliged to withdraw this opinion, and acknowledge its authenticity."*

Now, in regard to those matters of detail in which Gebler may be at variance with his Catholic opponents—we have no wish whatever to examine, in what cases he is right and in what wrong. In fact, the present writer has no critical power enabling him to elucidate such questions. But we do say confidently, that no Catholic controversialist need be unwilling to accept all the facts, precisely as Gebler states them; that the facts, as exhibited by him, are disgraceful to Galileo, and honourable whether to the Pope or to the other officials of the Church. The present writer, on three earlier occasions (October, 1865; April, 1871; July, 1871), treated in this REVIEW the controversial bearings of this Galileo question; and there is nothing we should like better, than that any reader, who may do us the honour of bearing in mind what we there urged, would proceed to test the accuracy of our statements of fact by a study of Gebler's narrative. Within the limits of a notice, we can, of course, refer only to one or two salient points.

The most important fact of all to a Catholic, we need hardly say, is that there is no pretext for alleging, that Copernicanism was ever condemned *ex cathedra*. Gebler himself, on two occasions (pp. 169, note; 236, note), points this out. He also quotes the express dicta uttered by Catholics of the period—Riccioli, Caramuel, Gassendi, Descartes—to the same effect; Riccioli and Caramuel being themselves intensely anti-Copernican.

Secondly, we have always urged that the Popes of that period would have grievously failed in their duty had they not done the utmost in their power, short of an *ex cathedra* definition, to repress Copernicanism. Since last we treated this theme, Cardinal Newman has expressed himself on the subject; and we cannot do better than quote part of what he says:—

Galileo might be right in his conclusion that the earth moves; to consider him a heretic might have been wrong; but there was nothing wrong in censuring abrupt, startling, unsettling, unverified disclosures, if such they were—disclosures at once uncalled-for and inopportune, at a time when the limits of revealed truth had not as yet been ascertained. A man ought to be very sure of what he was saying before he risked the chance of contradicting the Word of God. . . . Galileo's truth is said to have startled and scared the Italy of his day. It revolutionized the received system of belief as regards heaven, purgatory, hell, to say that the earth went round the sun; and it forcibly imposed upon categorical statements of Scripture a figurative interpretation. Heaven was no longer above, nor earth below;† the heavens no longer literally opened and shut; purgatory and hell were not for certain under the earth. . . .

* The *Pall Mall* writer adds, "In the sense to be defined presently." These words refer to a point which we shall ourselves have to mention.

† See this point urged by ourselves in July, 1871, pp. 157-8.

Whither did our Lord go on His Ascension? If there be a plurality of worlds, what is the special importance of this one? And is the whole visible Universe, with its infinite spaces, one day to pass away? We are used to these questions now, and reconciled to them; and on that account are no fit judges of the disorder and dismay which the Galilean hypothesis would cause to good Catholics as soon as they became cognisant of it, and how necessary it was in charity to delay the formal reception of a new interpretation of Scripture, till their imaginations should gradually get accustomed to it."—*Via Media*, vol. i. pp. lv., lvi.

Cardinal Newman's immediate point here is the true and important one, that, even if the Copernican theory had been at that time cognisable as true, it was nevertheless the Church's bounden duty to keep back (as far as possible) from the knowledge of Catholics the fact of that theory having been established, "till their imaginations should gradually get accustomed to it." The thesis on which we ourselves laid stress was (as we may say) antecedent to this. We entirely denied, that the Copernican theory *was* at that time cognisable as true. In fact, even as regards the scientific argument taken *exclusively*, Galileo's alleged discovery was hardly more than what is vulgarly called a "fluke."* On the one hand, the argument on which he laid more stress than on all others put together—viz., that based on the *tides*—is now universally admitted to be utterly worthless. On the other hand, the physical objections to the theory were so serious, as to be entirely incapable of removal in the then existing state of science. Gebler refers to both these facts (pp. 127, 244); at the same time, naturally enough, he does not lay that stress upon them which is surely their due.

This being so, the thesis we have throughout advocated has been this: Nothing less than full scientific proof of some new physical theory can justify Christians in interpreting Scripture, otherwise than according to its one traditional and one obvious sense. But as soon as such scientific proof is forthcoming, the relevant passages of Scripture may legitimately receive a figurative interpretation. Moreover, we have alleged that this was throughout the recognised principle of Galileo's theological opponents. Gebler quite bears out this latter statement. Thus, in the early part of Galileo's career, Cardinal Conti, "who was very friendly to him," said to him that the figurative method of interpreting Scripture is "to be employed only in case of the greatest necessity" (p. 41). And Father Grassi (who, with Bellarmine, was perhaps his most earnest theological opponent) said that, "when the truth of these opinions was unanswerably established, the theologians would bestir themselves to alter the interpretation of those passages of Scripture which refer to the earth as being stationary" (p. 121). We quoted other theological testimonies to the same effect, in July, 1871, pp. 162-3.

Against this thesis of ours, two objections have been made, to mention no others. Firstly, it has been alleged that the Church did not proceed on the principle which we maintain; for that she fully tolerated Copernicus's work at a much earlier period. Gebler points

* See July, 1871, pp. 159-161.

out (pp. 14, 15) that the case was quite otherwise. In Osiander's Preface to Copernicus's work, it was distinctly stated that Heliocentrism was not otherwise therein advocated than as "a hypothesis which need not be considered even probable, as it was only intended to facilitate astronomical calculations." And, though a few other writers (p. 38) had (before Galileo) speculatively advocated Heliocentrism, yet their advocacy had had no kind of practical influence, and was therefore very reasonably ignored by the authorities. The case was fundamentally different when Galileo began to gather round him an influential school of thought.

Secondly, it has been alleged, with a similar purpose, that Urban VIII., when Cardinal, had been favourable to Galileo's tenets; and that he would never, as Pope, have proceeded against that offender had not his vanity been wounded by the circumstance of Galileo holding him up to ridicule under the name of Simplicius. Gebler, in the course of his work, denies every successive detail of this allegation. (See pp. 62, 110, 134, &c. &c.) It is simply impossible, he says (p. 160), that Urban VIII. could have considered himself intended by Galileo under the name of Simplicius. And Gebler sets forth (p. 162) what he considers to have been the Pope's true motives in instituting the Galileo process. At the same time, Gebler thinks (but we can ourselves see no ground whatever for the supposition) that personal reasons of a different kind did occupy a place, though but a subordinate one, in moving the Pope to action.

One fact, which told strongly against Galileo in his trial of 1633, was that in 1616 he had been commanded—not merely to abstain from advocating Copernicanism otherwise than as a mere scientific hypothesis—but to abstain from treating it in any way whatever. The official document stating this will be found in p. 77. It is dated February 26th. Now, whether or no it were true, in 1633, that Galileo had violated the injunction of 1616, by treating Copernicanism otherwise than as a hypothesis—nothing can be more certain than that he had violated that injunction by treating the subject *at all*. Galileo, therefore, was driven to allege that he had entirely forgotten that particular part of the precept imposed on him; and Gebler himself, in his first edition, maintained that, at all events, the alleged document of February 26th was *spurious*. This was the opinion which Gebler retracted in 1877, after his laborious examination of the Vatican MS. But, even before he had instituted that examination, we are a little surprised that Gebler can have acquiesced in such a view. He never doubted the authenticity of the document of February 26th (printed in p. 77), which records the Pope's instruction that the precept in question *shall* be imposed on Galileo; and this makes his original rejection of the *other* document less intelligible. But it would require several pages, even to touch on the various matters suggested by this little controversy.

We argued, in April, 1871 (p. 363), that the command imposed on Galileo, of *interior assent* to the Decree of 1616, was most reasonable, apart from any supposition of its having been issued *ex cathedra*. The whole course of Gebler's narrative corroborates (to our mind) the ground

on which we based that statement. We find also (p. 236, note) that Gassendi—while expressly denying the *ex cathedrâ* character of the Decree—nevertheless “recognised its high authority,” and “subjected to it his personal opinions.”

We said, in April, 1871 (p. 366), that Galileo acted throughout as a man “who was restrained by no sense of truth, of loyalty, of honour.” We think that the whole of Gebler’s volume emphatically bears out this statement. All who have studied Galileo’s letters are unanimous (we believe) in holding that, from first to last, he entirely embraced the Copernican theory. This being so, it follows that his whole dealings with ecclesiastical authority made up one consistent piece of organized hypocrisy. (See pp. 66, 94, 99, 100.) In 1630 he described the Decree of 1616 as “a salutary Edict” (p. 129). In 1633 he declared *on oath* that he had “regarded” the Copernican arguments “as inconclusive;” and had (in his inculpated work) “intended to refute them” (p. 215). At the same period he promised with an oath that he would denounce to the Inquisition every advocate of Copernicanism he should meet with.* On the other hand (p. 280), “he did not hesitate to act in opposition to his solemn oath, literally construed,† by secretly sending a copy of his condemned and prohibited ‘Dialogues’ to Diodati at Paris, that they might be translated into Latin, and thus more widely circulated.” How were the authorities to deal with such an offender?

We should think that so odious and despicable a character as Galileo can very seldom have appeared on the public stage; and we think that successive Popes dealt with him far too mercifully. During his trial of 1633, says Gebler (p. 210), “as far as his material situation was concerned, nothing but favours unheard of in the annals of the Inquisition were shown him.” ‡

W. G. WARD.

[Since the preceding notice was sent to press, another strongly anti-Catholic writer has pronounced a warm eulogy of Gebler’s work, in the *Examiner* of June 7th. This writer says that “the leading points” of the Galileo case, as regards matters of fact, “may” now “be regarded as finally set at rest.” If such a statement of facts as Gebler’s be really accepted by non-Catholics, Catholic controversy on the subject will have made a most important step forward.]

Essays from the DUBLIN REVIEW. By W. G. WARD, D.Ph.
London: Burns & Oates. 1879.

THESE Essays, the publication of which in a separate form will give great pleasure to Dr. Ward’s numerous admirers, are ten in number. They are mainly occupied with the controversy raised by

* Such, at least, is Gebler’s interpretation (p. 247) of Galileo’s promissory oath; and we should say plainly the true interpretation.

† We should like to have asked Gebler how Galileo’s oath could have been “non-literally construed.”

‡ Gebler adds, indeed, that “nothing was left undone to find the best method of effecting his moral ruin.” But this is a matter rather of opinion than of fact; and we cannot even conjecture what Gebler means by such an opinion.

Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon* in reference to the prerogatives and worship of the Blessed Virgin. Two hundred pages of the volume before us are taken up with an exposition, in Dr. Ward's well-known earnest and logical fashion, of the great principle which is at the bottom of Catholic devotion to our Lady—viz., that, as Jesus is the way to the Father, so is Mary the way to Jesus. He says, in the interesting preface which he has prefixed to this re-publication:—

There are certain particulars in Catholic devotion to the Most Holy Virgin, which, at the time of my conversion, were felt by me as difficulties; though I accepted them (as was surely most reasonable) on faith. At a very early period, however, of my Catholic life, what appeared (and appears) to me the true rationale of those particulars, presented itself to my mind. I heard it said by Catholics on all sides of me that Mary is the way to Jesus, as Jesus is the way to the Father. Let this statement be taken—not as a vague generalization or rhetorical exaggeration—but as the literal truth, and then the whole matter (I came more and more to think) is clear enough. I came more and more to hold that Catholic devotion to our Blessed Lady, even in the extremest shape which it wears among authorized and approved writers, does but legitimately develop the dogma of the Incarnation. I came, indeed, more and more to hold that any lower and less prominent devotion to her implies a deficient apprehension of that central Christian dogma, as regards its reasonable practical results. And, conversely, I came more and more to hold that the objections commonly brought against the Catholic cultus of Mary—if they had any relevance at all—would be equally, nay, in a still greater degree, relevant against the Christian worship of Jesus (pp. viii, ix).

The first Essay, which is very long, covering some hundred pages, travels over a large number of the points usually made by Anglicans against Catholic devotion to Mary. Many of our readers will probably remember its appearance some thirteen years ago. Leaving the patristic and scriptural difficulties for separate treatment, this exhaustive article treats the doctrinal objections of Dr. Pusey; and Dr. Ward certainly grapples with his opponent in the very closest argumentative battle. Dr. Pusey—and although the *Eirenicon* is an old book now, still every priest knows that numerous Anglicans yet hold similar views—says that it is true Catholics do not worship our Lady with divine honour, but they practically “go to” her instead of going to Jesus in order to be saved. They spend much time in praying to her—time which might have been given to Jesus; and their feelings are so enlisted in her worship, that practically they prefer to pray to her rather than to pray to our Lord. “The human mind is narrow, and easily filled with one thought,” says Dr. Pusey; “it seems inconceivable that many should not *stop short* in her.” Dr. Ward accepts this objection, and analyzes it; but first he takes it and intensifies it (p. 15). “Prayer to *her*,” he makes his opponent say, “will issue freely and warmly from the heart, while addresses to God will be little more than the perfunctory and external performance of a certain stated and prescribed routine.” Dr. Ward's line of answer—carried out with the greatest skill and in ample detail—is to admit the facts and deny the consequence. He admits that ordinary Catholics pray a good deal to the Blessed Virgin, and so omit to pray, during that time,

directly to our Lord; he admits that they often go to her with greater attraction (in the lower faculties) than to Jesus Christ; and he grants that their *sensible* devotion to Jesus is sometimes, and in some cases, less than their sensible devotion to Mary.

But he maintains that all this, instead of lessening their solid devotion and substantial love of God, increases it. In fact, devotion to Mary almost invariably causes an increase of the time given to direct prayer to Jesus. Then, knowledge and love towards God may be at certain times far more effectively promoted by prayer to Mary than by direct prayer to God and Christ. Dr. Pusey admits that, with ordinarily pious men, it often requires less effort and exertion to fix their thoughts on a created person, such as Mary, than on God Incarnate. On such occasions, therefore, their prayer to her will be "far more earnest, far less distracted, far more heartfelt," than if addressed directly to God. Again, devotion to our Lady, if constant and unremitting, will lead men to a loving contemplation of her history; of those "mysteries," joyful, sorrowful, and glorious, which are commemorated in the Rosary. But to dwell on her mysteries is to think of Him, in the most affecting and impressive way possible. Besides, "sensible" devotion is not opposed to "solid" piety. Most men cannot, on the whole, and in the long run, be *solidly* devout without a considerable share of *sensible* devotion. But sensible devotion, though keener and more vivid when its object is Jesus, is often more readily and immediately excited towards Mary.

In one word, then. Those Christians, of whom we are now speaking, are in general very far more easily diverted from worldly to heavenly thoughts, and very far more rapidly raised into sensible devotion, by the contemplation of Mary than in any other way. But sensible devotion (see pp. 22, 33) is of inappreciable value in promoting solid piety; and the contemplation of Mary, by its own nature, carries men forward out of itself into contemplation of Jesus and of God. Mary, therefore, is the way to Jesus, just as Jesus is the way to the Father (p. 45).

The "Protestant difficulty" that lies at the bottom of all this is really the utterly inadequate idea which nearly all Protestants have of the divinity of our Blessed Lord. They object to our making Mary equal to Jesus, because their only idea of Jesus is that of a glorified or privileged *man*. "Few Protestants," says Cardinal Newman, "have any real perception of the doctrine of God and man in one Person."

Besides this first Essay, there are others of great value on various parts of the great Marian question. But it seems to us that the great fundamental position, that, devotionally, Mary is the *way* (speaking of mankind generally) to Jesus, has never been more philosophically treated than by Dr. Ward in these pages. It is a view of the utmost importance, and we should be glad to see the attention of Catholic theologians and philosophers turned to it with greater care. Its consideration will be found to involve the very essential elements of all worship and all devotion.

The other Essays relate to St. Paul's "opposition" to St. Peter, to

St. Mary Magdalene, to F. Coleridge's labours in the Gospel history, and to the narrative of the Resurrection. On all these questions Dr. Ward, as we need not assure our readers, has something acute and original to say.

Of the Love of God. Translated from the original French of Saint Francis de Sales. (Library of Spiritual Works for English Catholics). London: Rivingtons, 1878.

CONSIDERING that "English Catholics" are Protestants, we are astonished as well as pleased that this translation is so faithful and complete. Even Chapter 13 of Book viii., where "obedience to the Church" is laid down as the third of the tests that our inspirations come from God, is neither abridged nor otherwise "adapted." Can any English Catholic fail to remember what Church Saint Francis emphatically meant? Again, Chapter 8 of the same book is headed, "Contempt for the evangelic counsels is a great sin," and is given entire. We rejoice that "English" Catholics should think so, or here learn to think so: we cannot but add, however, that it should send them to their Litany petition, "Remember not, Lord, the offences of our forefathers."

We have grown used to finding our Blessed Lady's highest titles and praises in their manuals; we are, therefore, less surprised to see here the Saint's sweet and glowing eulogies of his glorious mother faithfully transcribed.

The translator has aimed at giving the sense rather than a literal rendering of the quaint and prolix French, so that in not a few places two or more sentences of the original are represented by one of the translation. The result is a book that reads easily and presents us with the Saint's thoughts in pleasing language. The translator may be congratulated on his singular success. There are a few, very few, places where we think we detect a suspicious softening of important expressions. For example, we read (p. 244), "A certain nobleman went to Palestine to visit the Holy Places, and *after due confession and communion* he reached Nazareth," &c. St. Francis says, "Et pour commencer dignement ce saint exercice, avant toutes choses il se confessa et communia dévotement." Even this, however, may have been done in good faith.

In his preface St. Francis digresses to tell how several villages near Geneva were brought back from Protestantism, "heresy," as the Saint says, partly by his labours, &c. All this is omitted, and in brackets we learn ["here follow some other unimportant details"]. The details are not necessary, indeed, but the translator's adjective would have pained St. Francis. Still more so would the translator's omission of the last paragraph of the preface, for which no bracketed excuse appears. We recommend this omitted conclusion to the special notice of "English Catholics." "I submit with all my heart, my writings, words, and actions to the correction of the Holy Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church, knowing that she is the pillar and the ground of truth,

which can neither deceive nor be deceived, and that no one can have God for his father who has not *this* Church for his mother. Annecy, the feast of the loving Apostles SS. Peter and Paul, 1616. Dieu soit beni!"

The texts in the volume are, of course, in the language of the Protestant version, and are thus less pleasing, if not annoying, to a Catholic reader; but, with this exception, its fidelity to the original and the beauty of language make it a book which we can recommend to all.

Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus. Vol. IV.
By HENRY FOLEY. London: Burns and Oates, 1878.

A VOLUME of 743 pages, well printed, carefully edited, illustrated with photographs and genealogies, containing a more or less elaborate account of over one hundred and fifty Jesuit fathers and others who laboured and suffered in the English mission during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—this description by no means exhausting the merits of Brother Foley's fourth volume. Those who have already made acquaintance with the first three will know that they may expect, in the one now before us, that interesting reference to originals, that painstaking accuracy, and that unwearying effort after completeness which constitute the charm of a book of records. The fourth volume travels over five of the "Colleges" or districts into which the Society had divided England for the purposes of administration—viz., those of Worcester, of South Wales (with Herefordshire and Monmouthshire), of North Wales, of Oxfordshire, and of Devonshire. Nothing could possibly be more interesting to a Catholic than the elaborate lives of Father Henry Garnett, Father Edward Oldcorne, and Brother Thomas Owen, and their connection with Hinlip Castle, near Worcester. Father Henry Garnett is, with the exception of Father Parsons and Father Campion, the best known name of all the Jesuit martyrs. A man of steady purpose, great governing power and infinite resource, he ruled and directed the Society in England for many years, passing through numerous deadly perils, and doing good everywhere, until, in the fever of the Powder Plot, he and Father Oldcorne were seized at Hinlip. With them, at Hinlip, was taken Brother Nicholas Owen, a man who had constructed or altered half the Catholic houses in the West Midlands, having "schemed," as Cecil said, "an innumerable quantity of dark holes for hiding priests all through England." A good third of the volume is taken up with the setting forth of the original documents and materials for a history of these three heroes. The circumstances connected with the search and capture at Hinlip are singularly full and minute; we seem to be under the very roof and to hear and to see, rather than to read, the whole story of the life of the great Catholic house, of the terrible danger all around, of the search, with its brutality, of the vicissitudes of the searchers and the hidden victims, and of the final discovery. Hinlip deserves a monograph to itself. Indeed, the publication of these records will throw a glamour of holy romance over many a spot where old Catholic houses

stood, where priests prayed and hid, where the people flocked for mass and sacraments, and where at last the armed officers seized perhaps both priest and host, and the gentle wife and children were left to mourn, and the people gradually, alas! to desert a faith whose knowledge they had no means of keeping up.

Sermons for all Sundays and Festivals of the Year. By J. N. SWEENEY, D.D., O.S.B. Second edition. London: Burns and Oates, 1879.

THE fact that a second edition of these useful and thoughtful Sermons has been called for is sufficient proof that they are appreciated. A sermon written with learning and care, in easy and attractive language, is one of the best possible instruments of spiritual culture. Pious people, who may be somewhat careless about religious knowledge, read it because it is a sermon, and learn something without meaning it; more cultured readers, wanting spiritual reading, yet impatient of mere pious talk, are glad to meet with food for thought and memory. Abbot Sweeney's Sermons are devout, instructive, and pleasant to read.

Introductio in Sacram Scripturam ad usum Scholarum Pont. Seminarii Romani et Collegii Urbani, auctore Ubaldo Ubaldi, Presbytero Romano, SS. Litterarum Prof. Vols. I. et II. Romæ, ex Typographiadi, Polyglottâ S. C. de Propaganda Fide. 1877 and 1879.

THIS work promises to be one of the most complete text-books on the Sacred Scripture ever written. The author modestly calls it an Introduction intended simply for beginners. But it is really a most thorough and exhaustive treatise on all important scriptural questions. The position of the author, as Professor of Sacred Scripture in the Pontifical Seminary, gives it also an extrinsic authority. Still there is none of the professorial *ipse dixit* in the treatment of vexed questions. Difficulties are fairly and fully stated, and answered in the fullest and kindest manner. Nor is there any disposition to bend facts to theories, as is very manifest in the author's treatment of the questions relating to the closing of the Jewish Canon. It can hardly be said that a new text-book on the Sacred Scripture is uncalled for, in these days when new defences are needed to meet fresh points of attack. The learned Professor seems to be as deeply versed in modern Biblical literature as he is in that of earlier times. Judging from the number of English books cited, Professor Ubaldi must be a complete master of English. It is surprising, however, that he has overlooked Dr. Pusey's defence of Daniel and the writers in the "Speaker's Commentary." The discoveries of Egyptologists and Assyriologists are generally turned to good account; but we were disappointed to find that the Professor had not adopted Rawlinson's identification of Daniel's Baltassar with Bil-shar-uzur, the newly-discovered son of Nabonadius. In defending the Pentateuch, the

learned Professor is not afraid to give battle to Evolutionists and Geologists on their own ground. But we do not know what the latter will say to his claiming their ice-boulders and mountain-shells as proofs of the universality of the Deluge.

The difficult subject of inspiration seems to us to be very ably treated. In an historical survey of opinions held on this matter, our author shows how Protestantism, which started with the most rigid theory of more than verbal inspiration, has ended in countenancing views scarcely consistent with the notion of any inspiration whatever. He quotes the ruling of the Privy Council in the *Essays and Reviews* judgment—"that it is not a contradiction to the law of the Church to affirm that any part of the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, however unconnected with religious faith or moral duties, was not written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit." The Louvain controversy about the three propositions of Lessius is very fully narrated, and it is shown how the decree of the Vatican Council has made the view, that subsequent approval was tantamount to inspiration, untenable. The Professor insists strongly on the distinction between inspiration and revelation. By inspiration he understands the actual and supernatural operation of the Holy Spirit on the intellect and will of the sacred writer, whereby he writes those things, and those things only, which God wills, though he may have learnt them from human sources. This Divine inspiration, he teaches, extends to the whole of the Sacred Scripture, and all its parts; but whilst the substance, the ideas, and subject-matter are from the Holy Spirit, the words, the form of expression and the style are left to the choice and individuality of the writer. This is quite in agreement with the old Jewish doctrine which taught that the law spoke the Word of God, but with the tongues of men.

The history of the Vulgate version is very fully told, with all St. Jerome's struggles and disappointments. The true meaning of the Tridentine Decree about its authenticity is clearly explained. The Fathers did not intend that the Vulgate should supersede the older Eastern versions, much less the originals; nor did they declare it absolutely perfect or faultless. Its authenticity is to be understood relatively not absolutely; the Vulgate, in preference to all other Latin versions, is declared to be free from all errors against faith or morals, and substantially in conformity with the original texts of Sacred Scripture.

The third and concluding volume, containing the *Introductio Exegetica* and *Biblical Archæology*, is to appear in the course of the following year.

Niccolò Machiavelli and his Times. By PROFESSOR PASQUALE VILLARI. Translated by LINDE VILLARI. In Two Volumes. London: C. Kegan Paul and Co.

THESE two handsome volumes contain a translation of the first half—the only portion as yet published—of Professor Villari's new work. The translation has been executed by an accomplished

English lady, once Madame Mazini (not Mazzini), who is now the wife of the learned author.

Professor Villari's name stands so high—and, in many respects, so deservedly high—that it is hardly necessary to say anything as to the respect with which every production of his pen is received by historical scholars. The present undertaking, judging from this instalment of it, will not be inferior to his former productions, and those who are unable to peruse it in the original will find it faithfully represented in Madame Villari's pages. In Germany, where, too, an excellent translation of it has appeared, it is reckoned by many competent critics his best work.

Our own view of the times of Machiavelli is in many essential particulars very different from that of Signor Villari, but even to indicate the principal points of difference would lead us far beyond the limits to which we are here confined. We certainly agree with the Professor's opening remark, that "it would be difficult to find any period in the history of modern Europe equal in importance with that distinguished in history under the name of the Renaissance" (p. 1). And we think he would agree with us that the point of view from which a man surveys this period is very much influenced by his first principles. Our largest common ground with the Professor must necessarily be where he confines himself to concrete facts. And therefore the second of these volumes, which contains the narrative of Machiavelli's life down to his dismissal from the office of Secretary of the Ten, and which is enriched by a very valuable appendix of original documents, appears to us of more worth than the first volume of introductory matter, where generalizations, abstraction, and deductions abound. But, even as to questions of fact, we are frequently obliged to withhold our assent from the Professor, because he too frequently and too implicitly follows authorities whose testimony seems to us, for various reasons and in various degrees, untrustworthy.

So much must suffice for the present regarding these volumes. When the work is complete, we hope to be able to discuss it at much greater length.

The Fathers for English Readers: S. Augustine. By W. R. CLARK, M.A., Prebendary of Wells and Vicar of Taunton. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

THIS little volume is planned and executed in a manner upon the whole very creditable to its author. The problem before him was, how in some two hundred pages to give an account of the great Saint and Doctor which should be intelligible and interesting to an unlearned reader. Mr. Clark thought that the best solution of this problem would be found by recounting "the early history of his life, and, indeed, the outward history of nearly his whole career, in the form of a continuous narrative;" and then grouping together

"his work and his opinions under the heads of the various controversies in which he was engaged" (p. 5). Accordingly the first four chapters are biographical; then we have chapters on the Manichæan, Donatist, and Pelagian controversies, and the dispute with Saint Jerome. Next come chapters upon the various writings of the Saint, upon his exposition of Holy Scripture and his preaching; and, finally, there is a chapter upon his last days. Mr. Clark writes throughout in a respectful and reverential spirit; his book is evidently the result of wide reading and much thought, and we are quite sure he is never intentionally unfair. An Anglican clergyman of the High Church school, he manifests indeed, upon occasion, as is natural enough, a certain amount of bias. Thus, his account of the condemnation of Celestius and Pelagius by Pope Zosimus (p. 114) suffers in clearness and accuracy from his reluctance—no doubt unconscious—to recognise the fact of the supreme jurisdiction of the Apostolic See asserted in such large terms in the Pope's letter to Aurelius. So, too, in writing of the Donatist controversy, he hardly appears to realise what the essential point at issue was. Most of our readers will doubtless remember how powerfully the study of that controversy affected Cardinal Newman when he was drawing near the Catholic Church, and how much he was helped by a paper regarding it, contributed to this REVIEW forty years ago by the late Cardinal Wiseman. Still, so far as it goes, Mr. Clark's volume is valuable, and we wish for it a wide circulation. To diffuse knowledge regarding the Fathers of the Church must do good—must, in the long run, help the progress of the Church. No unprejudiced person, no layman of fair intelligence and moderate candour, could, we venture to affirm, read this little book without arriving at the conclusion that S. Augustine belonged to a school essentially removed from that which numbers Mr. Clark among its adherents; that the Christianity of his age was radically different from any form or phase of Anglicanism. It is abundantly clear—no Protestant writer of repute ever ventures to impugn it—that the Saint's creed rested upon authority. His famous saying (Con. Ep. Man. i. 6), "I should not believe the Gospel unless the authority of the Catholic Church moved me to do so," reveals the very fundamental basis of his doctrine. The great question rests now exactly where it did then. It is a question of authority or private judgment. It is not a question of conflict of authorities, for surely there is but one communion in the world which claims the submission of all men as an infallible authority coming from God: one Church which demands implicit obedience as the voice of Him who cannot lie. Only he who cleaves to this One Church—Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman—can say in the language of S. Augustine: "The consent of peoples and nations detains me; the authority which was initiated by miracles, nurtured by hope, augmented by charity, confirmed by antiquity, detains me; the succession of priests, even to the present Episcopate, from the very See of the Apostle Peter, to whom the Lord committed His sheep to be fed after His resurrection, detains me; finally, the very name of Catholic detains me, which that Church has

alone, and not without reason, obtained among so many heretics" (De Util. Creden. i. 35).

Six Judgments of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in Ecclesiastical Cases (1850—1872), with an Historical Introduction, Notes, and Index. Edited by WILLIAM G. BROOKE, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. Third Edition. C. Kegan Paul and Co.

IN this volume, now in its third edition, Mr. Brooke has given the text of the judgments pronounced by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in the cases of *Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter*, *Liddell v. Westerton*, *Williams v. the Bishop of Salisbury*, *Martin v. Mackonochie*, *Hebbert v. Purchas*, and *Sheppard v. Bennett*—judgments of capital importance towards a correct appreciation of the true teaching of the Church of England, and of the tenableness of the ground assumed by certain Anglicans of the advanced High Church school. These documents supply abundant materials for the answer of the question, "Is Ritualism honest?" The honesty of individual Ritualists is, of course, a very different matter. The following summary—and it is a very fair and accurate one—is given by Mr. Brooke, at the end of his volume, of the points ruled by the Court in the six judgments of which he has previously furnished the full text:—

With reference to the ornaments of the Established Church and of the ministers thereof, in the administration of the Lord's Supper, the following points have been ruled:—

The Church of England has no altar of sacrifice (pp. 69—73, 238, 255, 256, 257). The Lord's Table must be of wood, and movable (pp. 73, 253—257). A Stone Altar is illegal (p. 73). Lighted candles on the Lord's Table during the celebration of the Lord's Supper, when not wanted for the purposes of light, are unlawful (pp. 122—129). The use of incense during the administration of Holy Communion is unlawful (p. 108). The use of embroidered linen and lace on the Holy Table during the administration of the Holy Communion is unlawful (p. 76). The mixed chalice is unlawful (pp. 108, 185—187). Wafer bread is illegal (pp. 187—191).

The use of the Chasuble, Albe, and Tunic while officiating in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper is illegal (p. 184).

The following points in connection with the Rubrics governing the administration of the Lord's Supper have been ruled:—

The celebrating Priest, during the Prayer of Consecration, must stand and not kneel, or prostrate himself, before the Consecrated Elements (pp. 118—122); bowing with the knee is kneeling and unlawful (pp. 142—146); bowing the head down towards the Table, and remaining some seconds in that position, is prostration, and unlawful (pp. 156, 158).

The north side of the Table, where the chancel faces the east, is the proper place for the celebrating Priest during the Communion Service, and also during the Prayer of Consecration (pp. 191—196). To stand at the north end of the west side, or with back to the people, is unlawful (pp. 193—198).

To elevate the cup, paten, or bread more than is necessary to take it into the hand of the Priest during the administration of the Holy Communion is unlawful (pp. 140, 157).

The following points in relation to the doctrine of the Church on the Lord's Supper have been ruled :—

The Church of England has no sacrificial altar (p. 238), nor any propitiatory offering on the Lord's Table (p. 239). To teach that the sacrifice, or offering, of Christ can be repeated is illegal (p. 239).

The Church of England does not affirm any presence in the Lord's Supper except a presence to the soul of the faithful receiver (p. 234). To adore the Consecrated Elements is illegal (p. 242).

Old English Drama: Select Plays. Marlowe's Doctor Faustus and Greene's Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay. Edited by A. W. WARD, M.A., Professor of History and English Literature in the Owens College, Manchester. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1878.

PROFESSOR WARD has done very good service in making more easily accessible to the ordinary reader two of the best plays of our pre-Shaksparian drama. The introduction, which occupies over 110 pages, is really excellent, and is quite a monograph on the whole subject of the "Faust-story," although Mr. Ward's style is occasionally rather cumbrous and awkward. The chief points he establishes are, concerning Faust himself, that he was neither a mere legendary personage nor yet the printer Fust, but a real person, probably Dr. Johann Faust, whose public life it will be safe to assign "to some time between the years 1510 and 1540;" round whom, however, gathered all the floating legends concerning magic and magicians that had been common, some even for centuries, and had got a fresh impetus at the Reformation. Concerning Marlowe's great tragedy, he establishes pretty certainly that it must have been founded on the very first edition of the *Faustbuch*, the first literary form of the legend of which we know, and which was printed at Frankfort in 1587; that the play itself was probably first performed "before February, 1589, and very possibly in 1588, or even 1587;" the German *Faustbuch* may very likely have been brought over by some of those English comedians who, we know, went about performing in Germany before 1588; lastly, that all subsequent dramatic renderings of Faust, German or otherwise, were founded on Marlowe's tragedy, which was known and even acted in Germany at least as early as 1626. Less of the introduction is devoted to Friar Bacon than to Faust and Marlowe; but the account of the great Franciscan is of exceeding interest.

One of the greatest of Mr. Ward's merits is his adoption for *Dr. Faustus* of the text of the 1604 quarto. The other editions are so much interpolated with matter altogether unworthy of Marlowe, as to be quite disfigured; and it is impossible to get a right appreciation of the power of the great dramatist in them. In Mr. Ward's excellent text, and with the aid of his copious notes, it may be read with real pleasure. Concerning the final scene (xivth), he quotes Mr. Fleay as calling it "the only dramatic death-bed scene which can be compared

in horror to 2 Henry VI., iii. 3," but we should hardly hesitate to rank the death-scene of Dr. Faustus above that of Cardinal Beaufort.

Life of Father Benvenuto Bambozzi, O.M.C. By Rev. Father NICHOLAS TREGGIARI, of the same Institute. Translated and abridged from the second edition of the Italian original, by a Lay-tertiary of Saint Francis. London: Washbourne. 1879.

THIS is an interesting and edifying narrative of the life of a modern saint. The story reads like a chapter of some Franciscan chronicle of the Middle Ages. Yet the holy Minor Conventual only died in 1875, and was himself one of the victims of the suppression of the Religious Orders which was decreed by the Italian Government in 1861. The poor friars who served the basilica of S. Joseph of Cupertino at Osimo thought that royal favour would have spared them. In September, 1861, the sons of Victor Emmanuel, on their way to see the battle-field of Castelfidardo, which is only a few miles from Osimo, were shown the basilica and the body of S. Joseph by the friars. But they were suppressed all the same, and, curiously enough, the decree of expulsion was dated on the very day of the visit of the royal princes. Father Bambozzi was a native of Osimo, and lived all his life either in that ancient town or elsewhere within the limits of the old province of Picenum, of which "Auximum" was the capital. The quaint life of that primitive region, the honest simplicity of its peasants, the apostolic labours of its clergy, the strong faith and piety of its people, are all reflected in this attractive little book. Father Bambozzi, leaving his sanctity out of the question—the "cause" of his canonization has been already begun—seems to have been a man of the best peasant type of Central Italy—busy, active, shrewd, and sincere, with a special faculty for putting his ideas into racy and humorous forms of speech. The original work from which the present translation and abridgment is taken seems to be written on the plan of those biographies which take every opportunity of making "improving" remarks. This is no harm in a spiritual book; but such remarks have a tendency to commonplace. The holy man's own contributions are by no means commonplace, and the few sentences quoted in his own original words make us long to have more. In translating these excessively idiomatic sentences, and also in condensing the whole work, and presenting it in readable English, the translator has fairly succeeded. We must not omit to acknowledge some excellent "translator's" notes.

The Poetical Works of Robert Stephen Hawker, Vicar of Morwenstow.
Arranged by J. G. GOLDWIN. London: C. Kegan Paul and Co.
1879.

ROBERT STEPHEN HAWKER was received into the Catholic Church the evening before he died, August 14, 1875. Those of his friends who really knew him were in no way astonished. Readers of

this, the first complete edition of his poems, will also understand how it was he sent for the Catholic priest at the last. His verses are full of Christianity, of worship, of sacraments, of the Saints, and of the Church. Moreover, they are full of real poetry. We would quote his "Song of the Western Men," were it not so well known. But there is another brief lyric which shows almost as remarkably that union of "suggestive" description with intense dramatic power which the legend-versifier of a wild historic coast ought to display.

MAWGAN OF MELHUACH.

'Twas a fierce night when old Mawgan died,
Men shuddered to hear the rolling tide:
The wreckers fled fast from the awful shore,
They had heard strange voices amid the roar.

"Out with the boat there," some one cried,—
"Will he never come? we shall lose the tide:
His berth is trim and his cabin stored,
He's a weary long time coming on board."

The old man struggled upon the bed;
He knew the words that the voices said;
Wildly he shrieked as his eyes grew dim,
"He was dead! he was dead! when I buried him."

Hark yet again to the devilish roar,—
"He was nimbler once with a ship on shore;
Come! come! old man, 'tis a vain delay,
We must make the offing by break of day."

Hard was the struggle, but at the last,
With a stormy pang old Mawgan passed,
And away, away, beneath their sight,
Gleamed the red sail at pitch of night.

A History of Egypt under the Pharaohs. By HENRY BRUGSCH-BEY.
Translated from the German by the late HENRY DANBY SEYMOUR,
F.R.G.S.; completed and edited by PHILIP SMITH, B.A. Coloured
Plates and Maps. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street.
1879.

THIS is a book of great value, and a standard work on Egyptian History. The author has made Egyptology his life study. For some years he held office under the Khedive, and has personally inspected well-nigh every monument in Egypt or papyrus in the museums of Europe. His work on Egyptian Geography, and his Dictionary of Hieroglyphics, rank him among the first Egyptologists of the day. About twenty years back Dr. Brugsch published in French a smaller work on Egyptian History; and two years ago he wrote, in German, a larger and more complete work, of which this book is a good translation, well brought out. The value of the work lies in the support it gives to Biblical History. It has fallen to Egyptologists to

vindicate the historical character of a great portion of Sacred Scripture, and thus put to confusion the unsubstantial theorizing of mythologists, and the ignorant carplings of sceptics. Like the ibis and the ichneumon, the sacred animals of Egypt, they have destroyed the crocodile's eggs and the serpent brood of modern rationalism. The older commentators were loth to acknowledge the Egyptian origin of many rites and ceremonies in the Pentateuch. But Egyptologists show that no stronger evidence of the authenticity of the Pentateuch can be adduced than the undeniable fact that its author must have learned all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and that, too, in the very time of the Ramessids. Egyptian monuments have a lesson, too, for those who boast of modern progress and despise the remote past as an age of barbarism. These monuments, Dr. Brugsch says, refute with scorn the geological fiction of a "stone, a bronze, and an iron age." The very earliest monuments prove that granite, too hard for modern steel, was carved with ease, and they surpass modern work, as much in the exactness of their masonry as in the grandeur of their proportions. "Beside them," Dr. Brugsch says, "our brick boxes full of windows, erected with the help of steam and the most complete appliances of machinery," are contemptible. He describes the colossal figures in the rock-temple of Ibsambul "as standing out from the wall of a rock like giant forms of olden time, and with a disdainful smile upon their lips looking down upon the pigmy race at their feet."

The history of Egypt, though most ancient, is in a certain sense very new. It is a modern revelation, disinterred from sepulchral hieroglyphics and mummified papyri. Of the earlier portions scarcely anything was known except from Greek sources. And how little these were worth is clear from the fact that Herodotus, "the father of history," was so simple as to believe that the inscriptions on the pyramids recorded the quantity of garlic consumed by the builders. Still it must be admitted that the monuments of Egypt are disappointing to historians. They pass over very interesting periods without a word; they are full of vainglorious boasting, and say nothing of defeat. The monuments of the Hyksos, in whose times it is agreed that Joseph and his brethren came down into Egypt, have been purposely destroyed. Dr. Brugsch shows that there were at different times frequent settlements of Semitic peoples in Lower Egypt, and their influence was very great. The Hyksos, or Shepherd Kings, were probably of this race. This will explain the welcome given to the Hebrews, and the hatred of the native Egyptians, which finally led to the expulsion of the foreign kings, and the accession of a native dynasty which knew not Joseph. It is clearly proved that Rameses II., the Sesostris of the Greeks, was the Pharaoh of the Oppression, and his son Manephta II., the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Zoan-Tanis, the Rameses of the Scripture narrative, was the city of their abode. Though the monuments say nothing about the Hebrews or their departure, they show that the Pharaoh of the Exodus was just the weak, mean man that Moses describes. He had the meanness to carve his own name on other kings' monuments. As to the

route of the Exodus, Dr. Brugsch has a new and startling theory of his own. He drowns Pharaoh not in the Red Sea, but in the Serbonian Lake—a lagoon on the shores of the Mediterranean, where Artaxerxes in later times lost a great part of his army. In addition to strong geographical reasons, drawn from the sites of places named in Exodus, he has been led to adopt this view from a very early and detailed account of the pursuit of some fugitive slaves from the royal city of Rameses. Other Egyptologists, according to Mr. Stuart Poole, in the *March Contemporary*, are not yet agreed upon the value of Dr. Brugsch's evidence for his revolutionary theory.

Besides Biblical matters there are many things of interest to the general reader. For instance, some light is thrown by the monuments on the position of women in ancient Egypt. They enjoyed the fullest liberty and equality, or rather precedence. They were not excluded either from the temples of Amon or the thrones of the Pharaohs. Still it must be confessed that Egyptian women do not appear to advantage in monumental history. Mural paintings exhibit their vanity and intemperance. Queen Hashop, the sister-wife of Thutmes II., is a strange character, about whom we should like to know more. But her name and history have been carefully expunged from most of her monuments, even as she herself erased the name of her deceased husband; a curious instance of stern monumental justice. This queen assumed a king's dress and a masculine style, yet her acts evince very feminine vanity and jealousy. Another queen signalized herself by introducing a strange heresy into the national religion—the worship of the sun's disc. The monuments contain just one word of encouragement to Egyptian bondholders. A painting in the tomb of Khamhat, the finance minister of Amenhotep III. exhibits taxpayers, of their own free will, paying over and above the amount required, and then going home quite contented, saying, "The king has shown himself upon his throne. The taxpayers of the north and south of Egypt have been rewarded" (vol. i. p. 438). No doubt the present ruler of Egypt would rejoice if his creditors could be so easily satisfied.

The Life of S. Patrick: Apostle of Ireland. By WILLIAM BULLEN MORRIS, Priest of the Oratory. Second Edition. London: Burns and Oates. 1878.

THE Patriarch and Apostle who laboured with so signal and permanent success that fourteen centuries after his death, "in the Vatican Council, no saint had so many mitred sons" as he, was necessarily a giant in his day. Tillemont says that God led him "in the ways of the prophets and apostles," to whom he bore a greater resemblance than to later saints; more especially, as he adds, do "we see in him much of the character of S. Paul." The complaint of the modern biographers of S. Patrick is that the prodigies related of him by his ancient biographers are received with incredulity, because they are unlike those of more recent saints. In the introductory chapter

of his life of S. Patrick, Father Morris appeals to his Catholic readers for a fairer hearing and judgment. They are reminded both of the similarity of the wonders related of him with those attributed by contemporaries to S. Anthony of Egypt, S. Gregory, Thaumaturgus, and others; and of the significant fact that if the miracles of S. Patrick want such authorization as would follow the rigid inquiry in a process for canonization, they have that other authorization scarcely, if at all, less powerful—their *results*: the complete conversion of Ireland and its steadfast loyalty through a wearily long history of opposition, persecution, exile, trial of every sort, to the first faith learned from its great Apostle. So that, to apply the famous dilemma for the miracles of early Christianity—the work which S. Patrick did and which lives to our day, is a greater marvel if done without the aid of his miracles than the miracles themselves are. And it is easier to believe the work *with* than the work *without* the wonders related of him. “Unchanging tradition and the religious life of the people” witness, therefore, in our day to S. Patrick in Ireland, as by S. Basil’s testimony they did in his day to Gregory Thaumaturgus in Pontus.

“The original idea of this short sketch of S. Patrick’s life,” Fr. Morris tells us, “was purely devotional:” nor has he deviated much from that original idea except to preface his sketch with an inquiry into the sources from which the biographer of the saint has to draw. He gives a singularly clear and interesting account of the ancient lives of the saint contained in the collection of Father Colgan, “the greatest of Irish hagiographers,” and of their evidential value. His object, therefore, is not with the “erudite pleasantries” that S. Patrick was the precursor of Protestantism in Ireland, nor with the so-called arguments of its upholders: he has a word for them, however, in passing, and always a pertinent and telling word. His verdict on Dr. Todd’s work is that that writer has attempted to make the facts of the saint’s life speak for his own foregone conclusion, “with so little success that in the end the impression left by the book is that his conclusions signally overthrow his premises” (p. 18). S. Patrick in his Confession “makes a short profession of his faith in the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation,” whereupon the Rev. Messrs. Gough, Gubbins, and Olden compare this with the Creed of Pope Pius IV., and triumphantly contrast the profession of faith of modern Rome with that of ancient Ireland. And Mr. Olden (“Epistles, &c., of S. Patrick,” by Rev. T. Olden, M.R.I.A., p. 39) sagaciously reflects: “From this comparison it is obvious that S. Patrick knew nothing of the twelve new articles added to the primitive faith by the Church of Rome.” On which Fr. Morris pithily remarks: “It is only necessary to observe that baptism and belief in the Holy Scriptures are included in those *new* articles, about which, according to Mr. Olden, S. Patrick *knew nothing*” (p. 159). An equally happy and effective reply is given to the Bardic theory, which still finds defenders (pp. 4, 11).

Having thus cleared away difficulties and replied to opponents, the Life proper of the saint commences. The writing of this is both able and pleasing: it is a well-ordered and succinct narrative in a style

marked by a simplicity, and sometimes almost a quaintness, admirably befitting the theme. The life is written with sufficient care and dependence on primitive authorities—to which frequent references are made—to serve the purposes of the student desirous to know the facts concerning a great man who changed a country's history; whilst the story runs from beginning to end with so much clearness, and is warmed by such a spirit of devotion for the saint of God, as makes it an acceptable book for spiritual reading. Both the student and the novice will find it a pleasant book. The author is to be congratulated on his success. A difficulty—not the least he had to contend with—must have been to secure the brevity he aimed at, without giving an incomplete picture; for the story of our Apostle and Thaumaturgus, living to one hundred and twenty years and never idle, is not easily compressed. This quality of brevity without a suspicion of dryness ought to make the volume as acceptable to English as to Irish readers. It would be but an evil consequence of the enthusiastic national admiration of S. Patrick if it led Englishmen to suppose that his life belonged exclusively to his own special children, and had little interest or lesson for themselves. The mere fact that S. Patrick came over to Britain with S. Germanus and had an active share in his work against Pelagianism in our isle, ought to create a link of sympathy between us and him. But, far beyond this, the labours of the children have bound us in gratitude to the Father. It is the Irish people, with the Irish priests, Irish nuns, and Irish teachers who have mainly contributed to advance the “second spring” in England; and as to the past, as Montalembert says, “more than two-thirds of England owed its final conversion exclusively to the labours of Irish monks” (tom. iv. p. 128, quoted by Fr. Morris).

The Description of Ireland and the State thereof, as it is at this present.
In anno 1598. Dublin: Gill.

THIS important work, edited by Father Hogan, S.J., will be of immense advantage to every student of Irish history. It consists of a concise description of every county in Ireland in the year 1598, with a list of the principal towns, castles, and families. It is to Ireland in some respects what the Domesday Book is to England. It was not compiled with the same fulness, it is true, but still its value as an historical monument cannot be over-estimated. It supplies important statistical information, regarding many places and families in Ireland, which cannot be had from any other source. The manuscript Father Hogan states to have been written between the years 1756 and 1811. The original was written in the year 1598 by an English officer. Father Hogan's copious notes cannot be passed over without a word of notice. They contain a mine of information, and cannot fail to prove of great advantage to every accurate student of Irish archæology.